

DUE DATE SLIP

GOVT. COLLEGE, LIBRARY

KOTA (Raj.)

Students can retain library books only for two weeks at the most.

BORROWER'S No.	DUE DATE	SIGNATURE

INDIAN FOREIGN POLICY

By
K. SATCHIDANANDA MURTY
Professor of Philosophy
Andhra University, Waltair

With a Foreword by
HAROLD D. LASSWELL
Yale University

AND
An Introduction by
QUINCY WRIGHT
University of Virginia

SCIENTIFIC BOOK AGENCY
103 NETAJI SUBHAS ROAD
CALCUTTA I

THE JEWISH STRUGGLE

BY

JEREMIAH BEN-JACOB

1942

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
LONDON

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1942



THE PAPER AND BINDING OF
THIS BOOK CONFORM TO THE
AUTHORIZED ECONOMY STANDARD

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY UNWIN BROTHERS LIMITED
WOKING

and are not yet broken. In a moment of weakness (in that unhappy phase of retreat before the Satanic powers) Britain found it expedient to curtail the scope of the Zionist experiment in Palestine. She was weary of the burden, she was afraid of the future, and she was not sure whether she was willing or able to execute the policy of the Balfour Declaration.

Then there is the immensely important problem of the challenge of Hitler. The Jews were the first victims of the Nazis. They were singled out as a special target. In fact, the main thesis of *Mein Kampf* is that the Jews are the source of all the world's misfortunes. But Hitler's challenge on the Jewish question has not been accepted. Both before and after the outbreak of war an embarrassing silence has descended in the West. The seriousness of the Jewish problem has been disregarded; the Jewish claim for recognition as an ally has been withheld; the offer of a Jewish army has been declined; and the significance of the Jewish people in the struggle for a new world has not been understood. Yet a Jewish problem does exist; an abnormal status has arisen and defects have developed. The Jew is sick in a world which is sick. But the remedy should not be silence or prejudice, just as it should not be the policy of hate and murder advocated by Hitler.

A radical and constructive solution is necessary, and I have, therefore, ventured, after a great deal of hesitation, to put forward proposals, which before 1939 would have been regarded as a utopian fantasy. I have done so because I believe that the world is tired of the old formulas and inhibitions, and is willing to examine the roots of problems and to consider bold solutions.

I have also attempted to raise the question whether the Jew is the villain or hero of our civilization. It is clear to me that people must now make up their minds about the role of the Jew in the world struggle and world reconstruction. The matter is of great urgency and cannot be ignored. For the moral foundations of the new world order are in danger.

When the history of the last few decades comes to be written without fear or prejudice, it will be found that the Jews have already played a salutary role in world affairs. In Soviet Russia the Jews have participated in the vast social experiment and in the glorious resistance to the enemies of mankind. In the United States the Jews have played their part in the remarkable rise of the United States in the economic and political life of the world; and in the Middle East the Jewish role in the regeneration of that region has been very considerable indeed.

But impressive as the record is it could have been more constructive and more dignified. The Jews have potentialities which have not yet been touched; for they are still demoralized, frustrated, and in many quarters unpopular. They were once compared to coal, which is black in appearance but which can be turned into light and energy. The coal itself is in the last analysis concentrated sunlight, and so is the Jew, who for centuries has been preparing and meditating on his destiny. Can mankind convert the Jews into moral energy?

The world has been deeply moved by the struggle of the Spanish workers against great odds, the patience and endurance of the Chinese peasants, the bravery of the Poles, the toughness of the new Britons, and the incredible sacrifices of the defiant Russian masses. Does it not also appreciate what the Jews have done for the Cause? For they have laid down their lives for the same ideals, and their record of suffering is not a year or a decade but two thousand years.

For centuries the Jews have resisted evil and have been in search of a new kingdom on earth and a new Jerusalem. They have followed a twofold programme laid down by the Prophets, viz. the salvation of mankind, and their own national salvation. Today they sense the coming of a tremendous climax. Humanity may soon enter the golden gate of history, and the Jews may soon find a home at the end of a tragic journey, and a place of refuge from the divine unrest.

A double salvation is involved in this crucial moment of history, and I cannot believe that the nations will exclude the Jews from their rightful heritage or that the Jews will not be among the prophets and crusaders of the new era.

JEREMIAH BEN-JACOB

OXFORD, 1942

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE	3
---------	----------------	---

PART I:—DELUGE

1. SURVIVAL	9
2. FOUR SONS	21
3. IN A BLIND ALLEY	39
4. THE JEW AND THE DELUGE	53
5. EUROPE AND THE JEWS	62
6. IN SEARCH OF TERRITORY	71

PART II:—ON THE STAGE OF WORLD HISTORY

7. THE JEW MEETS THE GREAT CONQUISTORS	89
8. THE JEW MEETS THE ANGLO-SAXONS	100
9. GERMANS OR ANGLO-SAXONS?	119
10. THE MESSIANIC VISION	129

PART III:—BUILDING A STATE

11. SEEDS	142
12. FRUSTRATION	150
13. BETWEEN TWO WARS	164
14. BACK TO THE JEWISH STATE	185
15. A NEW CIVILIZATION	193
16. A TALE OF THREE LANDS	209
NOTES	231

PART I
DELUGE

SURVIVAL

THE story of the Jewish people begins in Mesopotamia. At the dawn of history we already find a small, restless shepherd tribe established in the land of the two rivers in a centre of great civilization.

Whether Mesopotamia was the original home of the tribe or not we are not told, though we generally assume that the original home was the Arabian desert, that in the midst of a ceaseless struggle for water, shade and grazing fields, the tribe resolved to forsake the scorched and ungenerous earth for the fertile land across the desert, and that in the end it did succeed in reaching and settling in the "Fertile Crescent".

In the land of the two rivers the early Hebrews came in contact with a much more complex and richer life, with temples, buildings, wealth, royal courts, soldiers, priests, scribes, craftsmen, a system of law, irrigation, and a teeming population.

Yet they were not completely at ease. The world was young but rather unhappy. There was a great deal of confusion and bewilderment. Men watched the sunrise and sunset, the light and the darkness, the storms, the sea, the rivers and the beasts, and, like children, they were afraid. What was the meaning of it all? What forces were their friends and what forces were their enemies? What did they have to praise and thank and what did they have to fear and propitiate? They were groping in the dark, and in their confusion selected various objects to worship or fear. The sun and the moon, the rivers and the beasts, the stones and the images became gods. It was an age of childish nightmares and childish superstitions. It was the age of ignorance and spiritual chaos.

It was in that age, about four thousand years ago, that Abraham, the patriarch of that shepherd tribe, started pondering about the world around him. He pondered and

wondered and then he stumbled upon a very simple but tremendously significant idea, an idea which was to alter the course of history of mankind and to lead his descendants to the great scenes of history. He stumbled upon the idea of unity, design and guidance in the universe, that is, the idea of God.

Gazing at the stars Abraham saw a glimmering of monotheism, and heard a solemn promise that his seed would have a great future. Yet it was only a vague vision. The Hebrews were still a Bedouin tribe and Abraham a Bedouin patriarch. Judaism was not yet born, because these vague sentiments were not sufficient to form the basis of a national and religious life.

The search for God, however, continued. Centuries passed before the idea of God found embodiment in that most remarkable and unique instrument in the history of the world—Judaism.

The birth of Judaism is associated with Moses. "And there hath not arisen a Prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face." This biblical comment was later incorporated into the thirteen Principles of Jewish faith. "I believe with perfect faith that the prophecy of Moses, our Teacher, peace be unto him, was true, and that he was the chief of the prophets, both of those that preceded him and those that followed him."

It should be noted that Moses and not David occupies the central position in Jewish history. David was the real creator of the first Jewish State and it was he who established the capital, united the people, and extended the frontiers. But he was too much a man of the world: he loved power and he was flesh and blood. It was Moses, the prophet, and not David, the king, and the conqueror, who caught the imagination of the people and became the father of the Jewish people and its guide throughout the ages. It is Moses who is the towering Jewish figure in history, to whom the unique powers of vitality and longevity of the Jews must primarily be ascribed.

The birth of Judaism took place in the wilderness, when Moses was tending the flocks of his father-in-law. Moses, as a great Jewish thinker sees it, was already weary of the battle of life and was content with a peaceful existence. And in the stillness of the wilderness—the birthplace of so many visions and missions—he heard a voice urging him not abandon the struggle and go back to Egypt to save his people.

Moses went back, and out of a demoralized and disorderly rabble he created a nation which was outstanding for its spiritual strivings, search for social justice, and a sense of a national Mission. He gave Israel laws which have survived more than three thousand years. He made the Jewish people immune against the powers of disintegration.

The sceptics, of course, will say that Moses never existed, or that if he did exist he was not a Hebrew, or if he was a Hebrew he stole his religion from the Egyptians, and so on and so on. The calumnies, libels, and fantasies heaped upon the giants of mankind are numberless, and the modern theories of a great Jewish psychologist on the subject are just as unacceptable to the ordinary man as the anti-Semitic writings of Manetho and Apio in Ancient Egypt. They all belong to the grotesque and fantastic.

Winston Churchill, who has an insight into the history of the Jews and who understands what leadership means, has made an interesting contribution on the subject. "We reject", he says, "with scorn all those learned and laboured myths that Moses was but a legendary figure upon whom the priesthood and the people hung their essential social, moral, and religious ordinances. We believe that the most scientific views, the most up-to-date and rationalistic conception, will find its fuller satisfaction in taking the Bible story literally, and in identifying one of the greatest human beings with the most decisive leap forward ever discernible in the human story. We remain unmoved by the tomes of Professor Gedgind and Dr. Dryasdust. We may be sure that all these things happened just as they are set out

according to Holy Writ. We may believe that they happened to people not so very different from ourselves, and that the impressions those people received were faithfully recorded and have been transmitted across the centuries with far more accuracy than many of the telegraphed accounts we read of the goings on of today. In the words of a forgotten work of Mr Gladstone, we rest with assurance upon 'the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture'."

Moses was the great architect of Israel. After him arose other architects who enlarged and extended that structure. The Prophets, Ezra, Hillel, Akiba, R. Judah, Saadia Gaon and Maimonides are names of the more famous among them.

The very fact that the Jew, after a long and arduous journey from the dawn of history, is still on the scene of the modern world is due to these men, who with love and patience toiled day and night to build this immense structure of Judaism.

What is Judaism? Judaism is at once a faith in the unity of the cosmos, a complex system of laws and customs, a code of morality and a belief in the destiny of Israel and the unity of mankind. It is religion, nationalism, internationalism, law, and morals all combined in one comprehensive system. It is, above all, a mode of life organically bound up with the Jewish people and its history.

Underlying this vast structure is the belief that Jews should be kept apart from other nations and should not surrender their national identity. At the same time it is a belief in the unity of humanity, but a higher unity based on diversity. It is also a belief that in the attainment of that object the Jews have a great part to play.

To ensure that the Jews should survive as a separate entity to fulfil their destiny, Judaism erected a complicated system of laws and institutions, which should defy the centuries and should emerge from the catastrophes and upheavals of history. Empires rise and fall: armies overrun lands and continents. conquerors come and go: States grow and decay. But Israel must live and become eternal. Hence the

exclusiveness, the highly-developed instinct of self-preservation and the tough nationalism of the Jews.

Throughout the ages the Jews possessed in addition to their strong nationalist ideals a powerful strain of internationalist consciousness. The Old Testament is at first the story of a national mission and then it culminates in the great prophetic visions of universal justice and universal peace. The New Testament is the embodiment of the internationalist strain, but it is also the child of the Jewish people. It carries on the message of Judaism and spreads it to all corners of the earth.

The modern nationalized Jew is often attracted to Jesus, and is apt to regard him as a Jewish rebel and Jewish hero. Joseph Klausner, the historian, Jacob Epstein, the sculptor, Shalom Asch, the novelist, have built up beautiful and essentially Jewish conceptions of Jesus the man and the Jew.

The modern Jew stands for love and brotherhood among men and nations, and longs for world order based on justice. But nevertheless he maintains that the Jews were absolutely right in rejecting Christianity. Apart from any theological arguments, which do not concern us here, the complete overthrow of Judaism by Christianity would have meant the extinction of the Jewish people.

For Judaism, it must be emphasized once more, is much more than a religion. It is a mode of life for a whole nation. Once you overthrow the institutions the nation perishes. It has nothing to lean on and it cannot exist in a void.

It should also be remembered that the rise of Christianity coincided with the downfall of the Jewish State, and even before the inception of Christianity the majority of the Jews probably lived outside Palestine. The Diaspora was already a fact, and in order to live the Diaspora had to sustain itself on Judaism and its institutions.

There is an essential difference between the character of the Old and New Testaments. The latter is a very moving story, and some of the sayings and parables told there are of unsurpassed charm. But it is a story of a great movement

and not of a people. The Old Testament, on the other hand, is a national document, embodying folklore, history, religion, politics, literature and poetry. It was written by countless authors and expresses the character of a nation, with all its faults and virtues. Only such a national book could have served as "the portable Fatherland of the Jews".

Even the Bible was not enough. Its laws, customs, and institutions were not sufficiently elaborate and detailed. The Oral Law had to supplement this weakness and cover all the minute details of life.

Just before the downfall of the Jewish State, when Jerusalem was besieged by the Roman armies, a Jewish Rabbi—Yochanan ben Zaccai—asked the Roman conqueror for a small town in the south of Palestine, Yavneh, in order to found there a Talmudical college. He had in mind a new method of holding Jewry together, i.e. by substituting an intense religious and communal life for the secular State which was practically lost.

A miraculous process occurred. It was discovered that a nation could exist even after being deprived of its territory. The disembodied ghost began its long journey.

Thousands of Jewish communities throughout the world and throughout the ages succeeded in achieving unity and cohesion by imposing upon themselves a uniform and rigid system of laws and customs. Their leaders realized that rigidity and strictness were necessary in order to resist the forces of disintegration, and that fanaticism was essential for a society which wished to enforce its laws without possessing the machinery of government, police or soldiers.

The source of strength of Judaism is also the source of its weakness. Out-of-date laws and practices could sometimes be modified but not entirely abolished, and new and sometimes meaningless customs were added. Judaism, which is fundamentally a national code of life, assumed a more religious and ecclesiastical character. The synagogue became the centre of the community, and prayer and Talmudical study the most important occupations in life. Each genera-

tion of Jews spent its time and energy interpreting the arguments of previous generations. A vast accumulation of interpretations and customs rested on the narrow shoulders of the Jews, and became heavier and heavier to bear. They were not free, however, to throw off this load. They were in a state of suspended animation; Rabbinic Judaism was the artificial respiration which kept them alive.

That the burden of the Talmud was one which could not lightly be borne can be proved by a series of revolts against the Talmud and against the authority of the Rabbis.

One of the most important of such revolts was that of the Karaites. Anan ben David founded, in the eighth century, this sect, which called for a return to the Bible.

The movement seemed at first to carry everything before it. It certainly brought many benefits to Judaism as it purged Judaism of many of its superstitions and crudities. It introduced a fresh breath of criticism and reawakened interest in the science of Hebrew grammar. It aroused the love for Palestine and had a special appeal to intellectuals who groaned under the yoke of Rabbinic Judaism.

Yet the Rabbis, as events proved, were right and the Reformers wrong. After a few centuries the Karaites ceased to be of any importance and practically vanished from the highway of Jewish history. Karaism developed weaknesses which arose from the principle that everyone was free to interpret the law according to his own lights. Karaite unity became impossible. Important variations among the various communities developed and then inner cohesion was disturbed. The Karaite movement degenerated by reason of the very faults which it attributed to the reign of the Rabbis. It perished of internal bleeding.

About a thousand years later, Jakob Frank sought Rabbinic leadership in Poland and regarded it as his mission to save the Jews from the Talmud, "which is full of unheard of slanders against God and must be abandoned and disregarded". This movement also soon faded from the scene after a series of remarkable adventures.

Founders of great religions were also attracted to the idea of winning over the "People of the Book" to their creed. The best known examples are those of Mohammed and Luther.

The rise of Mohammed to prominence is closely connected with the Jews. To start with, there was the religious influence of the Jews, which was very strong in Arabia. Mohammed probably heard the stories of the Bible direct from the Jews. These stories so impressed him that he based his whole teaching on the Bible, and regarded himself as the continuation and culmination of the Hebrew prophets. Secondly Yathrib (Medina), where Mohammed began to make headway, had an important Jewish element in its population. Three of the five tribes in the city were Jewish.

At first he tried to win the Jews over. He recognized the greatness of their prophets, made his followers turn towards Jerusalem in their prayers, borrowed from them the formality and regularity of prayer, adopted some of the dietary laws, did his hair in the Jewish style, and made a treaty of friendship with the Jews of Yathrib.

The Jews, however, would have none of him. Their tradition was that the Messiah would be a Jew and a descendant of the House of David. Mohammed was not only a non-Jew but he showed a remarkable ignorance of the Bible, to say nothing of the Talmud. Haman, for example, becomes in the Koran the Minister of Pharaoh. And Ezra is described as the "Son of Man".

The Rabbis argued with him and decided that they knew the Torah better than he. Apparently Mohammed could only impress the heathen.

Hitler tells us in *Mein Kampf* how in his youth he would argue politics with Jews, and how, after having shouted himself hoarse, he would fail to convince a single Jew. This happened to Mohammed, and his failure with the Jews made him very angry with them. The Jews, on the other hand, added to this anger by ridiculing his claim to be the Messiah and by writing sarcastic poems about him and his followers. The Jewish elders expressed astonishment

that a person claiming to be a holy man and a prophet should pay so much attention to women.

Perhaps the Arab Jews were rather pedantic and failed to appreciate the political genius of Mohammed. After all, the criterion of statesmanship is not knowledge of Hebrew or knowledge of the Bible and the Talmud. Yet beneath their arguments with Mohammed and their sarcasm was there not present that stubborn refusal to be deflected from their destiny as Jews? If the Jews refused to follow Jesus, a son of their own people, into splendid oblivion and national suicide, how could they be expected to follow a non-Jew?

Martin Luther made the same mistake. In his work, *That Jesus was Born a Jew*, written in 1523, Luther speaks kindly of the Jews and defends them against Christian slander and Christian persecution. He complains that the Jews have been treated as if they were dogs and not human beings, and that the Popes, Bishops, Sophists, and Monks have done nothing for them but curse them and seize their wealth.

Later in life, however, he became hostile to the "stiff-necked race". He had hoped that the Jews would accept his new doctrines of Christianity, but instead the Jews went on arguing with him, and even attempted to convert Christians to the Jewish religion. He was disappointed, and in his bitterness and anger he published anti-Jewish writings, of which *Concerning the Jews and their Lies* (1543) is the most notorious.

He suggested that the best way of dealing with the Jews was to treat them with severity and roughness. Their synagogues, he said, should be set on fire: their homes should be broken down and destroyed, and they should be put under one roof or in a stable like gypsies. They should be deprived of their prayer-books and Talmud and their Rabbis should be forbidden under the threat of death to teach any more. Passports and travellers' privileges should be absolutely forbidden to the Jews. They ought to be stopped from usury and should be compelled to do hard labour. "Let the young strong Jews and Jewesses be given the scail, the axe, the

hoe, the spade, the distaff and spindle and let them earn their bread by the sweat of their noses as is enjoined upon Adam's children."

All so simple and so characteristically Hitlerian. With one sweep of the hand the great popular leader of Germany hoped to dispose of the Jewish misfortune. "For, as has been said, God's rage is so great against them that they only become worse—worse through mild mercy and not much better through severe mercy. Therefore away with them . . ."

Luther, like Hitler of today, has no understanding of the historical forces which for centuries were at work to push the Jews deeper into the mire of misery and away from the fields and workshops. And like Luther he shows little appreciation of their aspirations and no faith in their ultimate destiny.

The Jews would have none of the Germanic leader. The momentary attraction between them gave place to repulsion and bitterness. The Jews chose to go their way, cursed and denounced by the man they had rejected.

The Jews go on marching and their story goes on unfolding itself with the structure of Judaism still intact and still safe. Then the modern era comes, and with it ominous developments are revealed. First—the internal menace. Judaism is rapidly losing its hold on the Jewish people. The oxygen which has kept them alive so long is fast becoming exhausted. The crisis of religion throughout the world has seriously affected the great religious nation—the Jews. It is no exaggeration to say that the edifice of Judaism is not so solid as it was and that the possibility of internal collapse cannot be overlooked.

Secondly, there is the external menace of modern anti-Semitism poisoning Europe with hate. Anti-Semites reject Jews as fellow citizens no matter what their religion or national allegiance is.

The modern age also sees the increase in the powers of the State and its growing intervention in the economic, social, and political affairs of the nations. *Laissez-faire* and capital-

ism are in decay. Can the Jews, who managed to find a corner in the Roman Empire, Medieval Europe and liberal Europe, find their places in the new giant State which seeks to control every activity and seeks to crush every alien element? Can the Jews escape the choice of being ground to pieces or being vomited by the modern Leviathan?

At no time in the history of the Jews and Judaism has there been such a danger of extermination or extinction.

At this critical juncture of events a great Jew appeared and was able to realize the magnitude of the threat in Central Europe. Dr. T. Herzl (1860-1904), the founder of Modern Zionism, was a journalist by profession and lived in Paris and Vienna. At the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century Paris and Vienna provided excellent positions for observing the growth and intensity of the anti-Semitic movement. In Paris the Dreyfus case put anti-Semitism in the forefront of French politics, and on the outcome of the issue the whole future of the French Republic depended. In Vienna the Jewish problem was acute. To that same city, in which Herzl was planning the creation of a Zionist movement, there came a few years later a mal-adjusted and hysterical youth. In Vienna Adolf Hitler received his anti-Semitic education and in Vienna he was already planning an assault on Jewry—an assault which turned out to be the greatest in history.

Recognizing the signs of the times and taking note of the danger signals, Herzl made a bid to save his people. He declared that escape was only possible by a complete metamorphosis of the Jews, and this metamorphosis could only be achieved by the setting up of a national State. Judaism must either become Zionism or it will cease to exist.

The urge for survival reasserted itself. Herzl founded the Zionist movement to save the Jews from the coming deluge, and the Jews began to be aware of threat and began to organize resistance against the danger of extermination.

In the life of every people significant moments occur which prove to be of decisive importance—these are the

moments of destiny. In the history of the French, for example, such a moment occurred when the peasant girl, Jeanne d'Arc, heard voices urging her to save her people from the invaders. In Jewish history we have already referred to the birth of Judaism in the wilderness and to Yochanan ben Zaccai's inspiration as he was walking in the streets of the besieged capital. The days and nights when Herzl wrote *The Jewish State* can also be said to belong to these great moments.

We know from Herzl's writings that he was under a great emotional stress at the time and was profoundly convinced that his mission was to save Israel. Time stood still as he was writing. A great idea was born. A new prophet arose in Israel.

He himself says "I do not remember ever having written in such an exalted state of mind as this book. Heine says that he heard the pinions of eagles fluttering over his head when he wrote certain verses. I also felt that I heard a similar rustling over my head when I wrote this book."

He summed up his feeling in the words, "For me life has ceased and cosmos begun." When he talked to his intimate friend, Max Nordau, about his new idea, the brilliant philosopher and sceptic said: "Were I a believer and did I ordinarily use mystical phrases, I would say your appearance in these critical days of Jewish history is the work of Providence."

FOUR SONS

A discussion on Jewish Nationalism

Judaism performed a miracle in landing the Jews after great adventures and disasters safe and sound in the modern era. But its vitality — which astonished the world — has become exhausted in the process, and its authority greatly reduced. The modern sons of the old Jew have been thrown into perplexity and confusion. They are not certain of their place in the world, and for decades they have been arguing over fundamentals, i.e. whether a Jewish nation exists, and if it does whether it ought to exist.

The modern Jewish family has produced four sons. (1) The extreme internationalist, or rather anti-nationalist, who wishes to see the establishment of a world State and the rise of a cosmopolitan humanity. (2) The assimilationist who believes in every nationalism except his own. (3) The pessimist who recognizes the reality of Jewish nationalism, but who would, nevertheless, like to see its disappearance from the face of the earth. (4) The nationalist Jew or the Jew who takes his nationalism for granted.

Having introduced the members of the family, let us begin the debate.

THE INTERNATIONALIST (a composite figure made up of Karl Marx, Zinoviev, and a contemporary cosmopolitan intellectual from Bloomsbury):

"I regard the survival of the Jews as an error of history and evolution. Judaism is nothing but a chaos of laws and traditions and a commercial code based on greed and egoism. The sooner the Jews get rid of their absurd customs, spirit of exclusiveness and capitalist outlook, the better."

"Why should we endure the stifling atmosphere of the ghetto when the whole world is open to us? Why should we

be confined to the dark and narrow 'Judengasse', when we can have sunshine and wide horizons?

"Not only Jewish nationalism but nationalism generally is a misfortune. It is the root of evil, hatred, jealousy, wars and massacres. Only when frontier posts are removed and men become the citizens of the world and not of their particular countries shall we have the good life.

"Zionism is an anachronism in the modern world—a morbid obsession with past glories, dreams, tragedies, and crimes. In its modern form it is simply a nineteenth-century prejudice and an out-of-date conception. It is a childish game of playing with soldiers, adult human beings should outgrow it.

"In any case, can we maintain that we are the descendants of those Hebrews who, thousands of years ago, lived in Palestine? Are we not more likely to be the descendants of Germans, Slavs, and Mongols?

"It has been said that 'a nation is a society united by a common error as to its origin', and biologically it is as illegitimate to speak of a 'Jewish race' as of an 'Aryan race'. There has been a continual infiltration of alien blood as a result of illicit intercourse between Jews and their neighbours. Large alien groups have been converted to Judaism *en masse*. The Kazars who embraced Judaism in South Russia were Mongols; the Yemenites are descendants of Arab tribes which adopted the Jewish religion; the Caucasian Jews are descendants of a Caucasian tribe which lacks the Mediterranean element in their racial make-up, while the Falashas are really negroes who were converted to Judaism. Moreover, it has been observed that many of the young pioneers in Palestine are perfect 'Aryan' specimens. An English writer once described them as 'Judaeo-Slavs', and the Arabs call them 'Moscobi' (i.e. from Moscow)."

THE ASSIMILATIONIST (a typical French Jew before the year 1940, or a German Jew before 1933, or an Italian Jew before 1938, or certain Jews in England and America of today) :

"I am a Frenchman and my religion is a mere accident. What divides me from other Frenchmen is only membership of a church. I feel very French and I know that my fellow countrymen regard me as a true patriot.

"Zionism is a great nuisance and danger. Zionists stir up too much trouble where there is no trouble and talk of maladies and impending disasters. They say France will become anti-Semitic. *Jamais*. That Frenchmen of the Jewish faith may lose their rights. *Jamais*. That Hitlerite ideas may prevail in France. *Jamais*.

"If only the infernal Zionists did not make such a fuss. Why organize meetings? Why approach the governments on the Jewish question? Why not let sleeping dogs lie? The idea that a Jewish problem exists in France is fantastic, and does not correspond with the reality. Zionists read too many anti-Semitic pamphlets which are written by extremists who do not represent the true France.

"We have in this country influence, positions, wealth and security. Why endanger them? Why cast doubt upon our loyalty? We have also ideals. What do we want a country for? We are made of something better. We are priests, teachers of ethics and missionaries. Our mission is purely religious and our destiny is in our dispersion."

THE SCFTIC (a Jewish 'anti-Semite' and pessimist, is to be found everywhere and in every generation):

"I recognize the reality of Jewish nationalism, though I do not believe that its survival is desirable. The Jews have suffered humiliation and persecution throughout history. Their tragedy has no parallel. What does it all mean? Where will it lead us? Why continue the agony? Why perpetuate despair, abnormality, and restlessness?

"I do not believe a national State is the way out. It is a mere dream: it cannot succeed in the face of the opposition of the Arabs, Islam, British Imperial interests, and the indifference of the world. And I wonder whether it will be a good thing if it does succeed. No, the solution is death—

national death. And why should we fear death? After the journey there is rest, and after the storm there is calm."

THE NATIONALIST JEW (a composite figure made up of Moses Hess, T Herzl, Achad Ha'am, Brandeis, and other Jews, both before and after the Deluge).

My conviction is that the concept of nationalism is essential in the scheme of things. That is why the majority of the Jews have not fallen a prey to the slogans of barren internationalism. Humanity consists of nations, each being an organic unit and each distinct in physical type and mental peculiarities. The fusion of humanity is impossible because the distinctions between nations are not artificial but primal and inherent. Nationalism is an organic life force without which the universe is dead and mechanical.

In biology I see how nature experiments by creating a variety of living things, each of its own peculiar structure and peculiar physiology. In human society the same principle applies. Each nation is an organism based on a peculiar plan and animated by certain ideas. These organisms react upon each other and thus influence the march of history. Nature will not allow itself to be defecated and will not tolerate the creation of a single cosmopolitan State, because such a giant monster would turn the world into a stagnant mass.

Englishmen, Chinamen, Russians, etc., should co-operate in the conduct of the world affairs, but imagine the chaos which would result if Englishmen, Chinamen and Russians who have absolutely different standards of values, whose roots reach deeply into different soils, are mingled together in one State and asked to live under the same laws and institutions. The world has never produced, and for untold generations is unlikely to produce, a man whose vision is broad enough to comprehend the intricacies and problems of all existing civilizations, but a nation has often produced exceptional leaders whose depth of vision makes up for their narrow horizon.

Nationalism is not a theory or a speculative suggestion. It is an obvious fact. The theories are made by those utopian dreamers who think that through a book or lecture they can alter the course of history and ignore the unremitting toil and patient experimenting of thousands of years. Their plan for a new world is so grandiose that God's own creation seems rather a modest affair.

Nationalism is essentially constructive. When it is not constructive it is a caricature and an abuse of nationalism. One has only to compare the achievements of Jewish nationalists with Jewish internationalists in order to be convinced of the truth of this proposition. The former have changed the face of Palestine and have brought up a splendid generation of young men and young women. The latter have talked and talked. The Zionists have their feet firmly planted on the ground while their Jewish opponents are walking in the clouds. The Zionist experiment is capable of growth and expansion while the seed of a cosmopolitan experiment cannot reach earth and cannot germinate.

The universal idea is, of course, a tremendous idea. If it takes into account two essential conditions it will be a great blessing. The first one is that it must recognize nationalism as a basic and organic unit of humanity and the second one is that an international order must be created by the process of growth and must not be artificial. The universal idea is now an inescapable necessity. No genuine nationalist can shut his eyes to the tendency of nationalism to assume a subjective philosophy and to ignore the rights of others. If allowed complete freedom nationalism tends to selfishness and destruction, just in the same way as human beings would behave if allowed unfettered liberty of action. The remedy, however, is not the abolition of nations but the working out of a system of co-operation among the nations. To be an extreme nationalist and an extreme internationalist is not a contradiction.

Many of the so-called "progressive" intellectuals are still impatient at the mention of nationalism. They consider it an

out-of-date conception, a nineteenth-century prejudice, and a childish game of playing with soldiers—which adult human beings must outgrow. Such people would benefit by reading the words of a famous modern scientist on the subject. "In the exuberance of youth", says Sir Arthur Keith, "I believed that reason and reason alone should determine our beliefs and our conduct. Some forty years ago I began to investigate the conditions and forces which had raised man to his unique position. I was then driven to the conclusion that among the chief determining factors of his rise were his inborn instincts and predispositions, particularly that which has come to be known as 'the herd instinct'. Closely allied to that instinct are the feelings which lead us to love our own land and our own people. I do not see, as the world is now, how man can throw away these crutches; without them he would be still in the jungle. Hence I pleaded that a prejudice—such as patriotism—should be given a recognized place in modern civilization."

The German Jews have a colloquial expression taken from Hebrew *Rishut*. To make *Rishut* is to demean oneself in a manner likely to incite criticism or disparagement. The intellectuals of this category succeeded only too well in inciting against themselves the aggressive instincts and intellectual fury of the Teutons and other European races. Like the Wicked Son in Jewish tradition, they were contemptuous of all national institutions, whether their own or of the land of their adoption. They disparaged everything and everybody; the Jew should not be a Jew and the German should not be a German. Nationalism is a lie and history is a fraud.

Recent events have not yet completely cured this habit of thought. There are still among us intellectual cripples who are prepared to throw away the "crutches" without having anything to lean on.

The second son is the naïve type. He is the most patriotic Englishman, Frenchman or American and he is only a member of the Jewish church. This attitude of super-

patriotism on the one hand, and deep embarrassment at things Jewish on the other hand, usually raises a smile and a chuckle.

For one thing, the Jews are a distinct national type because the outside world regards them as such. The anti-nationalist Jew may protest at this attitude, the Gentile friend may please him by sometimes agreeing with him and telling him that only membership of a different church separates them—(he certainly does not believe it)—the fact remains that this attitude is deep-rooted and now almost universal.

Before the last Great War an ingenious ideology was in vogue among some Jewish scholars of the West to justify assimilation. It was the ideology of the "Mission of Israel". They liked to believe that the Jews were such an unusual people that the physical laws of nature did not apply to them. Now that many nations have risen and have killed the "teachers" and the "missionaries" one hears much less of this theory. One begins to realize that owing to the growth of nationalism and étatism in the modern world, a genuine Jewish life within the boundaries of many host nations is practically impossible. A mission cannot float in the void: it must have a body: it must have flesh and bones.

But most assimilated Jews have no philosophy to justify their antagonism to the Jewish national movement. They are just afraid. Afraid for their skins, wealth and social position. They are in terror lest Jewish nationalism should undermine their security, and expose them to the charge of double loyalty.

Nationalism is essentially psychological, but the racial problem deserves examination since it is the physical counterpart of nationhood—the body which contains the soul. Are the Jews a race or not?

The Jews are a mixture of Mediterranean and Alpine races. Some four thousand years ago there took place a crossing of two strains—a tribe of Bedouins and an Alpine race which entered Palestine from Asia Minor. Since then, the Jewish racialists maintain, the Jewish people has kept

remarkably pure. The segregation of the Jews in the Diaspora was practically complete. There was no social intercourse and no intermarriage. Except for short periods, Judaism discouraged conversion.

The case against the theory of the complete purity of the Jewish race is certainly well-established and Jewish purists will do well not to imitate the fallacies of Hitler's racialism. But, then, no other nation can be said to be racially pure. England is proud of the many racial strains which combine to make the English a great nation, and in the United States we see a nation in the making by the process of a remarkable admixture of races and nations. If, from a purely, scientific point of view, it is not correct to speak of a "Jewish" race, then it is not correct to speak of an "English" or a "French" race.

Every nation, however, is composed of various racial stocks which combined in more or less defined proportions in its making, and this is also true of the Jews. The latter are more homogeneous than we think. The Jewish Khazars in Southern Russia consisted mainly of the ruling class and many of them ultimately mingled with the Karaites, a sect which had separated from Judaism and subsequently became lost in its surroundings, leaving only a dwindling community behind. The Falashas, Yemenites, and Caucasian Jews who are perhaps of an alien race, are really small and isolated communities. The bulk of Jewry is the Ashkenazi community and they represent 90 per cent of the Jewish people. In spite of a slight Germanic and Slavonic admixture, they are very much alike, all possessing the same racial stock and the same racial memory. Scratch a Jew in Moscow, London or New York and you will find that the differences are very superficial and that fundamentally they are very much the same.

In addition a common racial factor is present in the overwhelming majority of the Jews throughout the world, and an unbroken tie connects them with previous generations. One has only to see ancient drawings of Hebrews and

compare them with the modern Jews in order to be convinced of the remarkable similarity.

But it should be emphasized once more that nationalism is fundamentally a spiritual principle. An aggregate of persons conscious of a community of experiences or qualities which make them feel a distinct people is a nation. The Jews are a nation not only because they are themselves conscious of it but because the outside world is conscious of it too. There is in operation an external pressure which cannot be ignored. Like the proverbial elephant it is difficult to define a Jew, but it is not too difficult to identify him, even when he lives outside the main stream of Jewish life.

Now let us come back to our pessimistic and timid son. Like the super-patriot he is also an assimilationist but an honest one. The humiliations and suffering which the Jew has endured have so upset the balance of his mind that he goes as far as to advocate national suicide. Looking at the Jewish tragedy he asks, "What does it all mean? Where will it lead us?" Now this son is different from the son in the Haggadah¹ who cannot ask any questions at all; possessing an "inferiority complex" he asks too many questions. He broods over horrors and tragedies and is always—but not quite—about to commit suicide.

A normal person seldom has time to think of suicide and death. He thinks of life and of the way he can be of use to himself and to his fellow men. Similarly, a people must think of life and of the future and of the way it can play its part in the society of nations and the manner it can utilize its experiences and qualities. The Jews have had a remarkable history and few deny their great gifts. If they could overcome certain abnormalities and surmount certain obstacles which stand in the way of self-fulfilment, their future would be brilliant.

The true Jew struggles and believes, because intuitively he realizes that the Jewish people is one of the most unique experiments in human history.

The defeatist, on the other hand, looks insight into, and understanding of, the Jewish urge for survival and the motives behind it. Some have sought to find the answer to this riddle in the economic function of the Jew. Immediately after the rise of Islam the Jew played an important cultural and economic role as intermediary between Christendom and Islam. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries he contributed to the transition in Europe from a barter to a money economy, and in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries he played an important part in the rise of capitalism. Hence they have looked upon the Jew as an instrument of economic fermentation, and upon Judaism as a code of life designed to help the Jews in their money-making activities.

"The Talmud is not a book that lays down principles according to which the individual should prepare for life to come. It only furnishes rules for practical and convenient life in this world . . . Jewish religion is not concerned with moral problems, it is rather concerned with economic problems and very pretty ones at that." Thus spoke Adolph Hitler—the great "expert" on the Talmud and Judaism. But even less arrogant and more learned men than Hitler have held similar views. Both Karl Marx and Werner Sombart, for example, emphasized the economic aspect of Judaism.

Others sought to find the explanation of Jewish survival in the rigidity of the Jewish legal system—a system which minutely regulated the life of the Jew from sunset to sunrise.

Yet neither the economic aspect nor the legal one explains the soul of the Jew and his innermost longings. They are merely the mechanism which helped him to meet his physical wants. They are merely the façade which a superficial observer mistakes for the real thing.

The answer is more likely to be found in his religious mysticism and Messianic longings, in the belief that he had a part to play in the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth and that his part could not be done by anyone else.

A great living German, Thomas Mann, put it in these words: "The destiny of the Jews, their task and mission, these too, cannot yet be fulfilled. Their extraordinary endurance is proof of this. That they have not perished long ago, that they still live—and life has not been made easy for them—forces, or at least justifies, one to believe, that life still needs them, that they have been saved, with their special intellectual gifts to be instrumental in accomplishing life's purpose.

"Personally I have always felt it to be a fantastic and astonishing thing that this people still lives and has its being among us, this people tenaciously surviving and representing the amalgamation between the present and most remote past, between Europeanism and its origin in the Near East, manifoldly interbred, autochthonous elements, but for the greater part preserved in unmixed purity. These people look into our world with the dark intelligent eyes of former ages and the knowledge which is theirs by their suffering, their spirituality and reason. They form a secretly corrective element against our passions."

They provide the link between the ancient and modern worlds and their racial memory stretches back to the dim beginnings of civilization.

They produced great men of vision—the prophets—who penetrated the veil of the universe, talked with God and established eternal truths.

They saw the great empires rise and fall and met the great conquerors of the earth. They wandered in all countries and all climes. They suffered and learned. They lived with all nations, absorbed their modes of life. They were a people apart and yet so close to the nations among whom they lived that they became sensitive to world events and could listen with understanding to the rhythm of life. For "Israel amidst the nations", says a great Jewish philosopher, "is like the heart amidst the organs of the body; it is at one and the same time the most sick and healthy of them."

I have faith in these words. I believe that the day Israel, the sensitive heart of humanity, perishes, the whole body

of humanity will also die. The earth will become the habitation of wild and cruel human beasts. The strong will devour the weak and will in turn be devoured by the stronger. Cries of agony and appeals for help will be heard in the stillness of the night, and also in stark daylight, and they will remain unanswered. The law of the jungle will be supreme. As long as there is hope for humanity there is hope for Israel.

"UNTIL DAY AND NIGHT SHALL CEASE"

The sun and moon, these minister for ever;
 The laws of day and night come never to an end.
 Given as signs are they to Jacob's seed
 That they shall ever be a nation, that they
 Shall not be cut off
 If with the left hand He should thrust them
 Off, with the right hand doth He draw
 Them nigh
 Let them not say, "us desperate", at the
 Time of their ruin
 Let them only believe they are eternal, and
 That
 They shall not cease until day and night shall
 Cease (*Judah Halevi*)

Zionism v. Assimilation

Since its inception Zionism has had a bitter conflict with the assimilationists. The first Zionist Congress, the Balfour Declaration, the formation of the Jewish Legion, the White Paper of 1939, all these events did not pass without a "civil war" within Jewry.

When Herzl founded Zionism he was greeted with either ridicule or hostility. He was called "the Jewish Jules Verne", "honorary anti-Semite", and his policy was described as "desperate lunacy".

Before the opening of the first Zionist Congress, the German Rabbis issued a declaration saying: "Religion and patriotism alike impose upon us the duty of begging all who

have the welfare of Judaism at heart to hold aloof from the Zionist Movement and to abstain from attending the Congress which, in spite of all warnings, is to meet." A meeting of New York Jews announced its depreciation of "any formation of a Jewish State in Palestine in such a manner as may be construed as casting doubt upon the citizenship and loyalty of the Jews in whatever country they reside." The Jewish community in Munich protested against the holding of the Congress in that city with the result that the honour fell upon the Swiss city of Basle. The *Neue Freie Presse*, the Jewish controlled paper in Vienna, where Herzl worked as a literary editor, was perhaps the only important European paper which did not allow Zionism to be mentioned. Max Nordau branded this type of Jew in a striking sentence. "They are people who sit in a safe vessel and who use the oars to beat those drowning who try to clamber into the vessel."

During the last war the main battle between the Zionists and the assimilationists was transferred to London, when the future of Palestine was examined.

The most dramatic stage of the story of the Balfour Declaration was perhaps the opposition of the assimilated English Jews to the recognition of Jewish nationalism. Balfour and Lloyd George expressed their surprise and annoyance at the attitude of those who were hostile to their own people. The true Englishman grasped the significance of the moment, but the assimilated Jew was cold and unfriendly.

Zangwill described this type. "You may see English-born Jews bred at English Public Schools, at English Universities, sometimes even married into old English families, yet betrayed as un-English by just one point—they are against the rise of a Jewish State, with which every true Englishman sympathizes." Thus Edwin Montagu, the Jewish Secretary of State for India, was passionately opposed to the Zionist standpoint when the draft of the Balfour Declaration was discussed in the Cabinet, and in May 1917 a letter was published in *The Times* by the President of the Board of Deputies² and by that of the

Anglo-Jewish Association which maintained that "emancipated Jews in this country regard themselves primarily as a religious community and they have always based their claim to equality with their fellow citizens of other creeds on the assumption and in its corollary—that they have no separate national aspirations in a political sense. They hold Judaism to be a religious system." The letter was disavowed by the overwhelming majority of the Jewish population in England, but the efforts of the assimilationist Jews were not without effect. Owing to this kind of pressure, the Declaration was modified and delayed.

The attitude of the "super-British Jews" was also manifested in another event, namely, the despatch of a Jewish Regiment to the Palestine Front. In August 1917 the War Office decided on the creation of a Jewish Regiment. A deputation headed by Lord Swaythling and Major L. de Rothschild called at the War Office and protested against the name "Jewish" being given to the proposed regiment and against sending it to Palestine. Lord Derby, the War Secretary, decided to drop the word "Jewish" and Colonel Patterson, the Irishman who was to lead the Legion, was so indignant that he threatened to resign. It seemed as if the good work of V. Jabotinsky was about to lose all its significance. Jabotinsky, however, interviewed Mr. W. Steed, then editor of *The Times*, and the latter told him "tomorrow *The Times* will advise the War Office not to give in to these fools". Next day an article duly appeared, advising the Government to preserve the Jewish character of the Legion and to send it to Palestine. The War Office then decided in favour of the Zionists but compromised with regard to the title "Jewish", which was only to apply after bravery in battle. The fear of the assimilated Jews that their Russian co-religionists would bring discredit upon the Jewish community in Britain did not materialize. The sailors from the East End were favourably mentioned in various Military communiqués and the legion was subsequently allowed to assume the title "Jewish".

In March 1919 the Zionists presented their claims to the Peace Conference in Paris. At this point, too, assimilation raised its head, but this time it was of the French variety. A certain gentleman, M. Sylvain Levy, was asked by the French Government to represent French Jewry at the Conference. M. Levy gave the Zionists an assurance that he would not be hostile to them. Nevertheless, he gave the Jewish leaders at the Conference a rude surprise when, after a few words of praise, he thought fit to indulge in a severe denunciation of Zionism. His first point was that Palestine was a small and poor land and that it already had a population of 600,000 Arabs. His second point was that the Jews who would go to Palestine would be mainly Russian Jews who were of "explosive tendencies". His third point was that the creation of a National Home in Palestine would raise the dangerous principle of double Jewish rights.

Dr. Weizmann described the dramatic incidents that followed. "We debated what we should do and had a short confabulation. The points we had to consider were these. We had each spoken only five or six minutes. M. Levy had spoken for twenty minutes. If we asked permission to refute his arguments we would change the proceedings into a discussion between ourselves and M. Levy and this would not be dignified. Something in the nature of a miracle happened to relieve us of our dilemma. Mr. Lansing, the American Secretary of State, called me over and asked me, 'what do you mean by a Jewish National Home?' That opened the door for us and Mr. Lansing's intervention rendered us a very great service. I rose and said that our striving for the Jewish National Home means our striving for the creation of such conditions in Palestine that ultimately Palestine would become as Jewish as England is English. I then dealt with M. Levy's remarks and said that the Zionists' aim was very difficult, but it was not more difficult than present conditions for the Jewish people, and the question was not whether it was difficult but whether it

was possible. As far as the question of double allegiance was concerned, I pointed out that there was nothing in our proposals which raised that principle. In that sense, the Alliance Israélite might be regarded as invoking a double loyalty. There were few Jews who had qualms in this matter, but 95 per cent of the Jewish people had no such fears. It was true that the Russian Jews lived in an excitable atmosphere, but they were not responsible, and the very work which has been praised by M Levy had been built up by Russian Jews. Mr Balfour afterwards said he could hear in every sentence the swish of the sword. The proceedings ended and we withdrew. Mr Balfour immediately sent out his secretary to congratulate us on our success. As we came out of the Conference M Levy came out and tendered his hand. Instinctively I withdrew my hand and told him, 'Everything is ended between us, you have sought to betray us!' The same thing happened with Mr Sokolow."

The rise of Hitlerism and the solid achievements of Zionism in Palestine have to a large extent demoralized and disorganized the assimilationists. Nevertheless, behind the scenes they continue to gnaw at the foundations of Jewish nationalism. When the issue of Partition³ was debated, many influential Jews in England and elsewhere were opposed to Partition, not because the proposed Jewish State was too small, as many ardent Zionists believed, but because they had a vague fear that they would be compelled to emigrate to the new Jewish State and that the unruly Jews were bound to make a mess of things in such State. They were quite relieved when the threat of Partition was followed by the more serious threat of a minority status for Jews in Palestine and declined to do anything to help Jewry in Palestine on the ground that such help would be construed as an act of disloyalty to Britain and an incentive to anti-Semitism. They went so far as to declare in the Press that the demands of the Zionists were unreasonable, that England knew what was good for the Jews and could be

trusted. Genuine Englishmen, like the Archbishop of Canterbury and Winston Churchill, did not trust the Zionist policy of His Majesty's Government and considered it unjust, but the assimilated Jews were prepared to follow blindly the British Government in its attempt to deny elementary rights to the Jewish people.

The fear of anti-Semitism in England is not groundless, but it is certainly not dependent on support for Zionism. In pre-Bolshevik Russia the Jews were nationalists and supporters of Zionism. Yet these Jews, after the Revolution, were not deprived of their rights as men. In Germany, the Jews consistently opposed any manifestation of Jewish nationalism, and their loyalty to the *Vaterland* was rewarded by humiliation and expulsion.

In England, Zionism if anything has added to the dignity and prestige of Anglo-Jewry. The Englishman, more than anybody else, has respect for tradition and dislikes dissimulation and imitation. He looks at the Zionist Jew as the man who carries the torch of the Bible in his hand and at the assimilated Jew as the man who runs away from his place in history. Sometimes he may have certain misgivings about Zionist policy on the ground that it causes certain difficulties to the British Empire in its relations to Islam. But even then he seldom withholds his admiration from Jewish achievements in Palestine.

After countless generations the Jew appears in the role of a colonizer and a State-builder. Jewish farmers, Jewish shepherds, Jewish drivers and Jewish police are frequent items of news. The parasitic conception of the Jew is beginning to be regarded as out of date and the Jew is beginning to be looked upon as a creative force, who is abnormal only as a result of lack of opportunity.

The great majority of the Jews understand this and at critical times have rallied to the side of Zionism. In all conflicts between the Assimilationists and the Zionists the latter prevailed because they represent a mass movement, while their opponents, although influential and wealthy,

lack popular support. Zionism has a bold and constructive programme Assimilation is timid and negative. Zionism is directed by the trend of history and the spirit of the time, while assimilation is a futile attempt to arrest the march of destiny.

IN A BLIND ALLEY

ON the eve of the French revolution the Jews in Europe were still leading a medieval life. They lived in special quarters, wore special dress, spoke a peculiar dialect, lived on petty trade and moneylending and led an intense communal life centred on the synagogue and the Jewish school. They were subject to many legal disabilities, varying from country to country and from town to town, such as the payment of certain tolls and taxes, restricted residence and occupation, and even the restriction of the right to marry. In short, they still were an alien and isolated element in the organism of Europe.

The French revolution heralded the period of Jewish emancipation in Europe. The importance of the French revolution lies not so much in the change of the status of the Jews in France—their numbers did not reach more than eighty thousand of the estimated two and a half million Jews throughout the world—but in the position occupied by France in the life of Europe.

At the end of the eighteenth century and at the beginning of the nineteenth century France was the leading nation in Europe—*la grande nation*. It was then the great industrial nation as well as the intellectual leader of the Continent. Whatever was discussed in the French salons or said and written by French authors and pamphleteers found an echo in other countries which boasted or rather complained of a larger Jewish population.

Moreover, the revolutionary and Napoleonic armies did later overrun Europe and French troops carried the ideas of the revolution everywhere. Wherever they marched they brought with them the gospel of the rights of man which France had formally extended to the French Jews in 1791.

The movement of emancipation went on throughout the

nineteenth century, and in spite of setbacks due to the rise of the reactionary forces after Napoleon's defeat, its record of success was progressive and considerable. It culminated in the Russian revolution of 1917 and in the peace treaties of 1919 which guaranteed equal rights to Jews in various Central and East European countries.

During the period of emancipation the Jews entered with great zest into the cultural, economic, social, and political life of the nations. In their zeal, perhaps, they pressed hard—too hard for the comfort and peace of mind of the gentiles, who even then began to wonder where this rush to the Universities, law, literature, journalism, politics and bureaucracy would end.

The period of Jewish emancipation coincided—perhaps not by accident—with the growth of capitalist enterprise. The part played by the Jews in this epoch is one of the most fascinating and controversial subjects of modern history.

Werner Sombart in his book on the Jews and modern capitalism takes the view that the Jews are by tradition and upbringing the best agents of capitalism, and that they played a great role in the rise of capitalism, particularly in its early stages. He attributes the commercial decay of the Southern maritime countries and the rise of the prosperity of England and Holland to Jewish migrations and Jewish enterprises. He seeks to magnify the role played by Jews not only in Europe but also in America, and he talks of the American spirit being in fact the Jewish spirit. The book, which a few decades ago was a favourite among Jewish intellectuals, has been subjected to a great deal of criticism. Werner Sombart is taken to task for his failure to understand the spiritual forces of Judaism by laying too much emphasis on its legalistic and economic aspects. It is also considered that he exaggerated the Jewish role with regard to the capitalist development of Holland, England and America, where the Jewish role was and still is a minor one.

Most of his critics are Jews, and it is characteristic of Jews to seek to underestimate the role played by members of

their race in the life of the nations, just as it is characteristic of the gentiles to magnify Jewish power and influence.

That on the eve of the nineteenth century the Jews were ready to play the role of agents and carriers of capitalism is due to the fact that they had mobile capital. The rich Jews could not be compared in wealth and resources to the non-Jewish landowners; the latter, however, were handicapped because land and agricultural wealth were not easily convertible to cash. They had, therefore, to turn to the Jews, who were thus enabled to play an enormous part in the dynamics of capitalism.

Yet it is an error to assume that all the Jews were capitalists. Only a few did actually play the capitalist game. The Jewish masses on the whole went on with their humble and humdrum existence. The average Jew possessed neither a real commercial intuition nor that strange energy attributed to all Jews. He found happiness in study, prayer, and contemplation, and was content if he had a roof above his head and sufficient food to keep body and soul together. There is far more dignity and beauty in the story of these humble folks than in the careers of the great capitalists and barons.

How did it happen that this small section of Jews were in possession of mobile capital?

Usury was one of the main sources of livelihood for the Jews in Europe.

But with the growth of capitalist economy the Jewish moneylender was no longer the enemy of the non-Jew, but his friend and partner and, as a result of his newly acquired legal and financial security, he was able to reduce the high rate of interest which he had previously charged to cover his risk.

Another source of Jewish wealth was the Marrano trade between Europe and the new world and Europe and the Near East. In Hamburg, Amsterdam, London, Antwerp, Marseilles, and the West Indies the Marranos were in a position to accumulate precious stones and bullion, which formed an important item of their extensive trading.

In the seventeenth century the commercial activities of the German Jews, too, went beyond petty trade and money-lending—a tendency which was connected with the Thirty Years' War. From the pages of *Gluckel of Hameln's* life story one can get a clear view of the intense pre-occupation of the Jews with trade and money-making.

The Court Jews in Germany and the Jewish "factors" in Poland were also an important step in the evolution of Jewish finance and capitalism. The Court Jews were wealthy and clever men whose services were sought by German and Austrian Princes in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries. In the course of their duties they acquired privileges, influence (though often short-lived) and a knowledge of European affairs which helped them and their descendants to be familiar with the ropes of Europe and to play an important part in its economic life.

This is not the place to elaborate on the importance of the Jewish role in the rise of the capitalist economy, but the following facts selected from the works of competent economists will help the reader to form some idea.

In Berlin at the beginning of the nineteenth century thirty out of the fifty-two banking houses were Jewish. At the beginning of the twentieth century (1907) the Jews of Berlin contributed 30 per cent of the municipal rates, although their proportion of the population was only 5 per cent.

The Jews financed the rising national states and helped them both in peace and war. The Rothschilds, who "provide the key history of Jewish banking in the nineteenth century", were the backbone of the anti-Napoleonic league and in the thirty years following the Napoleonic war issued loans on behalf of forty-eight governments in Europe and elsewhere. In the first half of the nineteenth century the Rothschilds together with the Sterns, Pereires, and the Bischoffsheims played the major role in the issuing of state loans which helped to strengthen the central organs of the State.

In German-speaking lands the economic importance of

the Jews was especially great at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century. They were the pioneers in banking, export, import, and allied branches and thus constituted the nervous system of German capitalism. After the war of 1870-71 Jews became great industrialists and established large industrial enterprises, e.g. the Allgemeine Elektrizitätsgesellschaft and Hirsch Kupfer Co. and Orenstein & Co.

In the Slavonic lands Jews were the traditional traders and middle class. Their ascendancy among the backward Slavs was far greater than in the German-speaking lands, where they never controlled more than 20-22 per cent of the general trade.

They also played an important role as the pioneers of industry among the Slavs. Israel Brodsky, for example, introduced the sugar industry into Southern Russia, an industry which was later extended by his sons. In 1914, of the three hundred sugar factories in Russia, more than a hundred were Jewish.

The Jews helped in the rise of the textile industry in Eastern Europe. In 1821 Lodz was a village of eight hundred inhabitants. Within a century it became the Manchester of Eastern Europe and had a population of six hundred thousand (26 per cent Jews). The Jews introduced numerous spindles and hand looms almost in every house. In 1931 they formed 71 per cent of all textile manufacturers.

Both among the Germans and the Slavs, and in fact throughout the European Continent, the Jews played a great part in the building of the railways. Thus, the Pereires in France, the Bischoffsheim in Belgium, Hirsch in the Balkans, Bleichroder in Germany and Austria, and the Poliakoffs and the Günzburgs in Russia have all been closely connected with the growth of the European network of railways.

Now that Jewish capitalism in Europe is in ruins* one

* According to a Jewish estimate, Hitler has taken £2,000,000,000 from the Jews of Germany, Austria, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. The confiscation of Jewish property has, of course, been accompanied by the eviction of Jews from their economic positions.

can examine the old phenomenon more dispassionately and more objectively. Such an examination brings out the following interesting features.

(1) The mass of the Jews, it must be emphasized once more, lived—and still live—in poverty and distress. Only 3-4 per cent of the Jews were men of wealth, the rest were small traders, artisans and what Max Nordau has described as "Luftmenschen", i.e. with no specific trade or profession.

The prevalent idea that Jews can turn anything to gold is not borne out by the facts. The Jewish masses were badly fed, badly housed, and badly trained. They had a similar complaint to make about the successful Jew as the Scottish nationalists made to me in Scotland about the successful Scotsman. The Scotsmen said that it did not matter whether individual Scotsmen did or did not rule the Empire or predominate in the City. What mattered was that the people of Scotland were neglected and that their needs could not be satisfied by the fame and success of some of their sons across the border. The comparison between the Scots and the Jews is not fair to the Jews, because the latter did not live on their own soil and did not enjoy the open spaces and the cheerful fireside of Scotland. Hungry generations trod the Jews down, and darkness and despair were their lot.

What consolation was it for the poor Jew to know that Rothschild was a power in Europe, or that Hirsch was one of the most successful railway builders in the world? Even the philanthropy of these men—and not all of them were philanthropists—was not sufficient to satisfy Jewish hunger and want.

(2) The Jewish financiers and capitalists were never united and often competed against each other. Heine refers to Rothschild and Fould—Louis Napoleon's Minister of Finance—as "two Rabbis of finance opposed just as strongly to each other as were once Rabbi Shammai and Hillel".

A Jew, Sir Solomon Medina, financed Marlborough's troops, while another Jew, Jacob Worms, supported the French armies of Louis XIV. During the American civil war both sides were financed by Jews.

Herzl could make no impression on the Jewish financiers who were more French than the French and more German than the Germans. That is, incidentally, another refutation of the so-called "international finance" and its "conspiracy" against the world.

(3) The Jewish role in the nineteenth century forms a very interesting parallel to the Jewish role in the transition period from barter economy to money economy in the twelfth century. "The sovereigns of Europe," according to an English writer, "as yet unversed in the mysteries of systematic taxation, needed a class of men who would for their own sake collect money from the King's subjects and keep it, as it were, in trust for the King's treasury. At the worst, the Jews in a medieval country might be described as sponges which imbibed the wealth of the nation and then were squeezed for the benefit of the Crown. At the best they fulfilled the function of the clouds which collect the water in small drops and then yield it back to the earth in rich showers, the rainfall being only too often accelerated by artificial explosives."

It is strange that the Jewish race has a reputation for astuteness. In the last thousand years they displayed nothing but short-sightedness and always lived from hand to mouth. In Hebrew and Yiddish the Jews have a word—*Tachlit*. It means long-range planning of life with a definite end in view, in most cases to ensure livelihood and security. While the Jews urged long-term planning for the individual they were unaware of the need for long-range planning for the race as a whole.

The result of this lack of foresight is that the Jews have had the unenviable role of providing the nations of the earth with "sponges", "indirect tax-gatherers", and instruments for the building up of a new economic system— instruments which are discarded as soon as they can be dispensed with.

While many Jews were busy building up capitalist enterprises, other Jews were realizing that capitalism was so full of contradictions, so unjust, and so inefficient that its

destruction was necessary and inevitable. The Jews thus became not only the pioneers of capitalism but also the pioneers of Socialism and of Communism. They were not only fuel for capitalism but also fuel for revolution.

Some of the best and most selfless Jews in Germany, Austria, and Russia considered it their duty to give their lives for what they regarded as ideals of justice and progress, and it was they who gave expression to the spirit of the time, i.e. to the urge of the human race towards collectivism. The history of Socialism and Communism in all its phases and tendencies is not complete without reference to names like Karl Marx, Lassalle, Bernstein, Adler, Rosa Luxemburg, Leon Trotsky, Zinoviev, and Radek.

The establishment of Communism in Russia is an event of great importance to the Jewish people. A great experiment has been tried, and though we have not all the facts and knowledge required for a final judgment, and though the future may spring some new surprises, it is possible to arrive at some provisional conclusions.

(1) In the first place it must be emphasized that only a very small minority of the Jews participated in the activities of the Bolsheviks. This is amply borne out by the results of elections to the provisional national assembly of the Ukraine in 1918, and by the fact that on the eve of the revolution there were about one thousand two hundred Zionist societies in the Russian Empire and about three hundred thousand active members, and by the fact that the majority of the Jews belonged to the lower middle class.

M. Kerensky said in an interview to the *Jewish Chronicle* in 1918 "I am sorry to say that many Bolshevik chiefs are Jews, but on the other hand 99 per cent of the Russian Jews are against the Bolsheviks."

This, of course, does not mean that the part played by the Jews in the Russian Revolution was negligible. It has been argued that the Revolution could not have taken place without Lenin. It can also be argued that it could not have taken place without Trotsky or without the small

but active group of denationalized Jewish intellectuals who supported the Bolsheviks.

(2) The Jews, being the middle class, suffered far more from the Revolution than the non-Jews. For the non-Jews, of whom 85 per cent were engaged in agriculture, 6 per cent in industry and only 2 per cent in commerce, the transition to the new economic system meant much less of a cataclysm than for the Jews, of whom nearly 90 per cent were engaged in commerce, industry and handicrafts. Jewish suffering was particularly great after the Soviet occupation of Poland, the Baltic countries, and Bessarabia at the beginning of this war. A Galician Jew then said: "The Germans rob us because we are Jews and the Bolsheviks rob us because we are capitalists. The difference between Hitlerism and Marxism is only theoretical, in practice the Jew is always the victim."

The Soviet-German conflict has demonstrated that this view is short-sighted. The Jews have to thank the Soviet armies for arresting the process of the physical annihilation of European Jewry, which is one of the avowed Nazi aims. The Jews under Soviet rule have been allowed to fight back like men and to die like heroes. They have been spared the humiliation, agony, starvation and slow death which their less fortunate brethren have had to endure within the ghetto walls of Warsaw, Lodz and other towns.

Owing to the fact that the bulk of the Jewish population lived in the Soviet-German battle zone and to the fact that the Soviet war effort has shifted eastwards, a great Jewish migration has taken place to Soviet territories beyond the Urals. A new centre of Jewish population is rising in central Asia and masses of Jewish refugees are finding a new asylum and are recuperating from the Nazi nightmare. The significance of this new migration has not yet been properly understood. It is one of the greatest events in Jewish history.

The fact that the Soviet Union has given back to the Jew self-respect and dignity and the fact that it has rescued him from torture, outweighs in importance all differences of

opinion and approach between the Soviet Union and the Jewish people. The Jewish people knows that the Soviet Union, in spite of all appearances to the contrary and in spite of a difficult history and a difficult transition period, stands for humanity, justice, and the emancipation of mankind.

(2) The economic structure of the Jews in the Union is still abnormal in spite of the efforts of the authorities to encourage Jewish employment in industry and agriculture. The economic distribution of the Jews in the Soviet Union according to Jacob Lestchansky was as follows:

ECONOMIC DISTRIBUTION OF THE JEWS IN U.S.S.R.

	1924	Per cent	1929	Per cent
Officials and black-coat workers	420,000	33.0	520,000	37.2
Liberal professions	100,000	7.8	180,000	12.8
Labourers	300,000	23.6	300,000	21.5
Agricultural workers	110,000	8.7	100,000	7.1
Artisans	210,000	16.6	200,000	14.3
Commerce	..	2.5	—	—
Indefinite	100,000	7.8	100,000	7.1

The number of Jewish officials and black-coat workers is extremely high. In pre-Revolution days the Jew was to be found at the shop counter, today he is to be found (or rather was found) in Government offices. That the Jews are urban and better educated people explains but does not remove a dangerous state of affairs.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the Soviet leaders have been very anxious about the Jewish concentration in the bureaucracy and in the big towns, and attempted to counter it by a policy of dispersion to other parts of the Union and to other professions. The congestion of the Jews in the professions and administration has been made worse by the rapid rise of a non-Jewish intelligentsia.

It is impossible to tell how serious this tendency was or how it would have developed if the Germans had not

invaded the Union. Today when the territories in which Jews have been concentrated are in Nazi hands, the Jewish position there approximates to the Jewish position in the rest of Nazi Europe.

(4) It should be emphasized, however, that the policy of the Soviet authorities has been one of absolute equality between all citizens. Anti-Semitism was outlawed at the beginning of the Soviet regime. Article 59 of the Russian Criminal Code imposed severe penalty for any attempt to incite national or religious hatred. This law was adopted also by all other Soviet republics and was later incorporated into the criminal code of the Union, its basic principle being embodied in Article 123 of the Constitution. A high official summed up his Government's policy by saying. "We put both offending Jews and their enemies in prison."

Nevertheless there is evidence that an undercurrent of anti-Semitism has existed in offices and factories, a fact which has been admitted in speeches by Stalin and Kalinin. The fact that Soviet Russia refused to allow refugees to enter the Union in any large numbers obviously suggests that the country was not in a position to undertake an additional strain.

Stalin, it must be remembered, is suspicious of the revolutionary intellectuals of the old school and some of these intellectuals have been Jews. Leon Feuchtwanger describes an interview which he had with Stalin in 1937: "He became excited when we talked of the Trotsky trials. . . . He spoke bitterly and with feeling of the writer Radek, the most popular of the men involved in the second Trotsky trial. He described his friendly relations with the man. 'You Jews', he said, 'have created one eternally true legend—that of Judas', and it was strange to hear a man, otherwise so sober and logical, utter these simple, emotional words."

The fact that a large proportion of the executed Bolshevik leaders consisted of Jews, and the fact that Russia has been tending more and more towards nationalism and less towards internationalism, together with the elimination of many

Jews from positions of leadership in the country, suggest that something has been brewing beneath the surface and that the Jews have not entirely succeeded in attaining balance and harmony in the Soviet organization.

Trotsky at the height of his power in 1921 told Rabbi Maze of Moscow, who came to plead with him on behalf of a Jewish cause, that in his view it was worth while to sacrifice the whole Jewish nation for the success of Communist ideas. When he was an exile in Mexico he changed his view. He told an American journalist that a Jewish State was essential if the Jews were to escape from the problem of anti-Semitism. He did not believe, however, that Palestine was the solution.

(5) At the same time it must be admitted that assimilation made considerable progress since the Revolution. As early as 1927 11 per cent of the Jewish marriages were mixed. Yiddish has been declining and Jewish parents are reluctant to send their children to Jewish schools.

Many Jews believed that Russian Jewry was doomed to vanish into the Soviet organism. They welcomed such an end, because they saw in Bolshevism a solution to the agonies of the Jews. If death is a solution then it was legitimate to conclude that if no disturbances were to occur, and if the factors of the situation remained the same, the Jews would die a natural death. But other factors never remain the same and disturbances usually do occur. Today we are witnessing in Eastern Europe cataclysmic events which are bound to upset the hopes of the assimilationists and confirm the Zionists in their fears. Already the densely populated Jewish areas of White Russia and the Ukraine are under Nazi control and the work of the last decades has largely been wasted.

(6) To obtain a balanced view of the destiny of the Russian Jews one should bear in mind that their period of emancipation is less than twenty-five years (1917-1941). It is very short compared with the record of Jewish emancipation in the rest of Europe. It would be arrogant on the

part of the Jewish Communists to claim that the intoxication of their emancipation would not be followed by defection and disillusionment which Jews of other countries have had to experience.

(7) In fairness to the Soviet leaders it should be stated that they attempted to tackle the Jewish problem in a spirit of justice and goodwill, and there is no desire here to criticize them. I even think that they understood the Jewish question better than some of the professional Jewish Communists, whose advice on the Jewish question was born of a spirit of fanaticism and self-hate. Their advice did not represent the wish and interest of the Jewish masses and was not entirely in accordance with the generous policy of Nationalities adopted by the Soviet Union.

While Trotsky and Zinoviev saw no need for Jewish survival Kalinin, President of the U.S.S.R., made a declaration in 1926 that on the Jewish people "rested the great responsibility of maintaining its nationality. Because of this a significant proportion of the Jewish population must be compactly settled on agricultural land."

(8) While every nationality could develop its own culture the Jews were only allowed to preserve a feeble Yiddish cut off from the roots of Palestine, Judaism, Zionism, and Jewish history. With regard to Jewish history there has been some improvement recently. After the Russians had discovered that the history of the world and of Russia did not begin in 1917 and began to pay greater attention to the earlier periods of history and literature, the Soviet Yiddishists also made a discovery that Jewish history could be traced further back, and so books and plays have been published on Jewish heroes like R. Judah Halevi, Solomon Maimon, and even Bar Cochba.

Reading the Soviet Yiddish papers before the German-Soviet war was sad and amusing at the same time. There was not a single reference to Palestine, and none to the position of the Jews outside the Union. It was as if the other Jews lived on another planet. The leading articles were more

often than not mere translations of articles in the official Press. They were *Pravda* and *Trud* on a smaller scale, and had no individuality of their own. They were artificial and unreal.

(9) This state of affairs has now changed. There are indications that the Soviet Union is about to revise its attitude to the Jewish people and to Zionism. The co-operation between the Anglo-Saxons and the Soviets is likely to produce a more uniform outlook on world problems and consequently on the Jewish problem. If an agreement on the Jewish problem is reached between the Anglo-Saxons and the Soviets, it cannot fail to have excellent results on the future of the Jewish people and Zionism. Such an agreement would have to take into account the lessons which emancipation impressed on the Jews—lessons which they had to learn at a tremendous price.

For a century and a half the Jews lived in the fool's paradise of capitalism and today they are a wounded and dispossessed people. For a century and a half the Jews sent to the world great champions of Internationalism and Socialism. These Jews grasped the truth that world peace and social justice are the cardinal issues of modern times, but they failed to realize that Internationalism and Socialism must operate within the national framework. They did not realize that in order to play a part in the international community of nations—they must first be a nation and that if they wish to build up Socialism they must have Jewish Socialism.

The era of emancipation has ended. To say that it was a complete waste of time and energy is incorrect. If it had not occurred the Jews would have remained a medieval and degraded community. It was a mistake but a valuable and indispensable mistake. It was magnificent, but a blind alley, from which the Jews have now to retrace their steps.

THE JEW AND THE DELUGE

JEWISH history in Europe consists largely of a series of disasters with periods of respite intervening. These disasters have been the turning points of history, the elemental forces which have disturbed the inertia of the Jew and have driven him to new lands and new adventures. An understanding of the character and structure of modern Jewry cannot be complete without some knowledge of such events and their effects on the Jewish masses.

One thing can be said at the outset. The Jew is not good at divining the storm, and his foresight is rather limited. He sees the clouds but his ingrained optimism lulls him into a false sense of security. Often he is caught unaware and suddenly in the great blizzards of history. Yet, once a calamity occurs he displays unbelievable powers of endurance and stubbornness. The storm may be raging; the flood may be sweeping everything before it, yet he keeps afloat. His energy does not flag; his will to live does not fail; he makes frantic efforts and never lets go and in the end he reaches a new and safer land.

The first major disaster which overwhelmed the Jew since his appearance in Europe began in the year 1095. Towards the end of that century a gale of religious enthusiasm swept over the whole Continent. Christendom was rising from its stupor and was about to embark on the mission of saving the Holy Land from the infidel. It boded no good to the Jew. Historical floods have a habit of flowing in channels which offer least resistance and which are most accessible. The Crusaders who failed in the end to overwhelm the Moslems succeeded in uprooting the Jews of Western Europe and putting them to flight.

The second major disaster was the Black Death. About the middle of the fourteenth century a bubonic plague, originating in the Far East, was raging in Europe. Medieval

writers claim that about a quarter of the European population succumbed to it. Modern historians are sceptical of this estimate, but they do not underestimate the repercussions which this catastrophe had on the economic, social, and political life of Europe. "Among the moral results of this disaster the most shameful was a series of attacks upon the Jewish population, who at Mainz and other German-speaking towns were burned in their hundreds of thousands by an infuriated mob in the belief that the plague was a malignant device of the Semitic race for the confusion of the Catholic Creed" (H. A. L. Fisher, *History of Europe*.)

The cumulative effect of the Crusades (1095-1270) and the Black Death (1348-1351) was the practical annihilation of Jewry in Germany. The Jew realized that the prosperity which he had built for himself in the Rhineland would never return and he began to look for a new home. The West was closed for him, England expelled the Jews in 1290, France in 1301 and finally in 1394, and in Spain the fourteenth century saw the rise of antagonism and hostility between Jew and Spaniard. The Jew therefore turned towards the East of Europe.

Poland was the ideal land for immigration. It was vast and undeveloped. There was no middle class but only a backward peasantry on the one side and a nobility which despised work on the other. Moreover, during the thirteenth century the Mongol invasion of the country wrought such havoc that the Polish Kings actually welcomed German and Jewish settlers.

The Jews found the soil of Poland suitable for their growth and development. In the economic life of the country they played the role of the middle class and in their communal life they enjoyed self-government. Not since the age of the Exilarchs in Babylon did the Jews enjoy so much self-government. Jewish life in Poland was perhaps narrow and limited but it was intense and very Jewish.

The significance of the settlement of the Jews in the East cannot be overestimated. A great Jewish reservoir was

accumulated in that part of Europe which later periodically overflowed into the whole world and made the Jewish question such a grave one. In 1875 there were 7,750,000 Jews in the world, and of these 75 per cent lived in Eastern Europe. Today four out of five Jews in the world are either in Eastern Europe or are the descendants of Eastern European Jews. It is no exaggeration to say that the Crusades and the Black Death indirectly contributed to Jewish growth and survival in the world.

In 1492 the expulsion of Jews from Spain took place. The Spanish Jews were unlike the medieval Jews who were fleeing from the persecution of England, France, and the cities of Germany, but more like the German Jews in pre-Nazi Germany. They were merchants, physicians, scientists, agents and advisers of Governments. They played an important part in the affairs of their hosts. Their number was comparatively small yet their influence on economic and cultural life was out of all proportion to their numbers. They were the aristocracy of the land and one of its main economic mainstays.

The Spanish expulsion turned out to be a blessing in disguise. New and important Jewish centres were established by the exiles in Italy, Turkey, North Africa, and Holland, but they also laid the foundations of a new communal life in countries which later proved to be of decisive significance to the Jewish people. The first one is America. The New World in the sixteenth century became a haven of refuge for the Marranos, and despite an edict forbidding their settlement within the Colonies, and the institution of the Inquisition, they continued to arrive. They gradually spread to Mexico, the West Indies, and other parts of the Continent. They settled in Brazil in large numbers and later migrated to North America. They formed the nucleus of the future American Jewry which was destined to become the most powerful member of the Jewish family.

The second is England. After the expulsion of the Jews in 1290 no professing Jews were to be found in the country,

but in the course of the sixteenth century Portuguese Jews arrived and formed secret communities in London and Bristol. They were expelled but more settlers arrived. Menasse ben Israel, who came to London in 1655 to plead for the readmission of the Jews to England, was himself a Portuguese Jew from Amsterdam. Thus, the re-establishment of English Jewry was carried out by refugees from Iberian oppression.

The third country is Palestine. The medieval Jewish population of Palestine consisted of a handful of families who lived in abject poverty. The arrival of the Spanish refugees in the sixteenth century considerably enlarged the Jewish population in the four Holy Cities—Jerusalem, Safed, Tiberias and Hebron—which then became important centres of learning and Cabballistic mysticism.

The next turning point in Jewish history occurs in the year 1881 and is associated with the Russian pogroms. In that year Alexander II was assassinated by revolutionary terrorists, among whom there was a Jewish girl. On the accession of Alexander III to the throne, pogroms broke out in the South of Russia which spread like wildfire throughout the country. The authorities took the line that the Jews were to blame and enacted legislation with the aim of restricting their rights of residence and professional activities. The idea was to make their lives so miserable that they would leave the country. Hints were given from high places that the Western frontier was open.

The Jews, however, required no hints. Seized by a mass psychosis and impressed by the ominous utterances of their national poets and thinkers like Frug, Gordon, Lilienblum, the Jews began the greatest migration in their history. Between 1880 and 1913, 2,359,476 Jews arrived in the United States; the majority of whom came from Eastern Europe. The Jew turned West.

Two waves of the Russian migration are of particular significance, the one to the English-speaking countries and the other to Palestine.

In 1880 there were in America about a quarter of a million Jews, largely of Sephardic and German origin. Today, there are almost 5,000,000 Jews in the United States. In sixty years, therefore, there has been a twenty-fold increase.

The rise of the Russian Jew in America within such a short period is one of the most amazing phenomena in history. He landed in the New World penniless, without knowledge of the language and customs of the country and ground by years of persecution and poverty. Being of poor physique he could not do hard manual labour and tended therefore to become a pedlar or a worker in a tailoring shop. Pedlars, and even the more dignified class of commercial travellers, have often doors slammed in their faces. The Russian Jews, with their broken English and alien appearance, had to undergo even greater and more frequent humiliations. To work at a tailoring shop was not easy either. It meant long hours, uncongenial surroundings and bad pay. Yet the Jew, by virtue of training and inclination, was in his element in this Jewish industry, and tailoring thus became the economic basis of the Jewish immigrant, from which he later emerged to other trades and professions. It is no exaggeration to say that the Jew fought and won with his needle. Today he has his share in the national wealth of the richest land in the world.

The same story repeated itself, though on a smaller scale and under different circumstances, in England, Canada, and South Africa. Sarah Millin has an interesting paragraph on the coming of the Russian Jews to South Africa which deserves quotation. "They went across the veldt with a pack of goods on their backs, and they halted at Boer farmhouses and they sold their goods to the Boers, and they told them how things were in the big world and they exchanged jokes with them and they slept there the night. A few months later they reappeared. But this time with a Cape cart and horses. Then they bought and sold ostrich feathers. Often they settled down somewhere and opened a shop. Then they imported a bewildered wife and several children whom they traditionally

intended for professional careers. Or if they were bachelors, women of their kind being rare in those pioneering days, they married sometimes the big solemn daughters of their Boer hosts."

The year 1881 marks also the beginning of modern Zionism. The unhappy events in the South of Russia stirred the very soul of the Jew. The idols of assimilation lay all of a sudden smashed, and the Jewish intellectuals who dreamt of educating the Russian masses realized that first of all they had to educate the Jewish masses.

Important events followed the outburst of Jewish nationalistic feelings. The year 1882 saw the publication of *Auto-emancipation* by L. Pinsker, the arrival of the Biluim⁴ in Palestine, and the foundation of the colonies of Rishon le Zion, Ness Ziona, Zichron Jacob and Rosh Pina. If we except the agricultural school of Mikveh Israel founded by the Alliance Israélite in 1870 and the first abortive attempt by Jews from Jerusalem to establish Petach Tikva in 1878, these colonies are the foundation stones of Zionist colonization in Palestine.

While the Spanish disaster meant the beginning of urban settlement in Palestine, the Russian disaster caused the beginning of rural settlement.

Both the Spanish and Russian settlers were animated by great faith, but while the former were actuated by Messianic dreams and religious mysticism, the latter were imbued with a spirit of nationalistic fervour and longing for the soil.

Although the Zionist settlement in Palestine was on a much smaller scale than that of the United States, it was more significant and of a more revolutionary nature.

The migration to America was a disorganized flight of individuals, each seeking his own corner and his own salvation in the New World. In the migration to Palestine the settler merged his own destiny with that of his people. It was, as Achad⁵ ha'Am put it, "individual salvation plus national salvation".

The Jew who went to America found a rich and powerful civilization to which he tried (and with success) to adapt himself. In Palestine he had to build everything *ab ovo* and to form his own national organism. It was fortunate, therefore, that both Arab and Turkish life in Palestine were too weak and primitive to absorb him.

That many Jews acquired great wealth in America may be a good or a bad thing, but it is not a new thing in the annals of the Jews. Jewish history has many stories to tell of Jews who rose to wealth and eminence in their lands of adoption. But that young Jews should deliberately abandon Europe for Asia, University and family life for physical labour, professions and commerce for agriculture in order to build a new society is something novel and significant in the life of a people.

1881! What a tragic year to people who lived through it. But what a merciful and generous year to the destiny of the Jews. The birth of Zionism, the mass migration to America, the end of emancipation and the dawn of self-help. How would our Jewish world look today without Palestine and America? Modern Jewry would probably have gone under if it were not for these movements which have built up the Yishuv and Anglo-Saxon Jewry. And it was all caused by a courageous reaction of Jews to a great earthquake of history.

Now we come to the greatest calamity of all time—the Nazi rise to power. We previously used the terms flood and earthquake to denote historical disasters, but neither is sufficient to describe the present upheaval. It is a combination of both and something more. It is an earthquake which destroys your home; a flood which seeks to drown you when you look for shelter; and a pestilence which means to follow and undermine you even if you succeed in reaching safe lands. Nothing like it has ever happened before.

If pogroms and mob violence are the criterion, this upheaval can have historical parallels which superficially

seem to be as serious. In the years 1648-58, for example, hundreds of Jewish communities were destroyed as a result of the Cossack rebellion and the subsequent invasion of the country by the Russians and Swedes. Some chroniclers estimate that as many as half a million Jews lost their lives in that deluge. Another example is the struggle between the Reds and Whites in 1918-22, when 1,500 pogroms are said to have taken place in Southern Russia and at least 100,000 Jews said to have been killed.

We do not know the number of Jews who have perished in Eastern Europe under Nazi rule, but in the earlier stages of the Nazi rise to power Jews suffered comparatively little from the effects of mob violence, but a great deal from organized robbery and relentless persecution by law.

In former times pogroms and mob violence were more often than not the expression of sudden flashes of bad temper and anger. They rose to great heights but soon subsided. The pogroms of the Nazis, on the other hand, are sustained by a steady flame of hatred and Satanic ingenuity.

The next aggravating factor is that the entire resources of a mighty State and the whole machinery of propaganda have been utilized for torture and death. The Crusaders, the Cossacks and the White Guards were clumsy amateurs compared with the Nazi experts on persecution and extermination.

Further, the disaster of Hitlerism is so ominous because it is of a universal and not merely of a local character. In the past, if things were wrong in one city the Jews could migrate to another. If things were wrong in one country they could migrate to another. The secret of Jewish survival was that his persecution was never simultaneous in all cities and all lands. Today, the floods of Hitlerism have swept a whole continent and have reached all the quarters of the globe. Even in lands of plenty and tolerance the other side of the Atlantic, Jews have to be on the defensive and to answer charges and accusations inspired by the Nazis.

The last aggravating factor is that almost all doors are

closed to Jews who have been caught in this gigantic trap.

The English-speaking world has given refuge to almost a third of the Jewish people. Even with the best will in the world it cannot absorb the rest of the Jewish masses without serious social and economic disturbances to its own life.

Since the beginning of the century one English-speaking country after another reversed the policy of free immigration and adopted restrictive legislation. England was the first to get alarmed at the inflow of aliens and the agitation against them resulted in the appointment of a Royal Commission and ultimately to the passing of the Aliens Act, 1905. After the last war the United States passed the well-known Quota Act, which struck a heavy blow at Jewish immigration. The British Dominions have also adopted legislation to restrict and control immigration. Even the Boers, by tradition the great friends of the Jews, pressed for the limitation of Jewish immigration to South Africa, and in 1930 the South African Quota Act became law.

It appears that a nation, even a friendly nation, cannot stand more than a certain number of Jews. Just before the outbreak of the second world war the problem of the Jewish refugees became acute, and in spite of frantic appeals on behalf of these refugees, only a small fraction was admitted, and even this admission caused an undercurrent of irritation and suspicion against the Jews.

To anyone who can see, nothing seems so self-evident as the fact that Jews have exhausted the hospitality, not only of their enemies, but also of their friends the Anglo-Saxons, and that the old practice, two thousand years old, of running from one country to another, cannot work in present-day conditions. A new method of rescue must be found to replace the antiquated expedient of flight.

EUROPE AND THE JEWS

Two civilizations and two problems

One of the most typical stories of English insularity is the alleged comment made by *The Times* on a Channel gale which temporarily cut off communications between Europe and England "Gale in Channel Continent isolated." It illustrates, however, two other important truths First, that this narrow stretch of water between Europe and England is a gigantic barrier between two different worlds and two species of humanity which have evolved along divergent lines Secondly, that England is not merely a small island off the European continent but an outpost of a powerful and world-wide civilization of the Anglo-Saxons.

In both of these civilizations there is a considerable Jewish population—about ten million in Europe and nearly six in the Anglo-Saxon countries—and in both there exists a Jewish problem The Jewish problem, however, like many others, is of an entirely different nature in each of the civilizations. It is an error to assume that conclusions reached about one are valid for another

The Jewish question in Europe is, of course, a more serious affair, especially in Central and Eastern Europe where the bulk of the Jews is concentrated. Central and Eastern Europe have historically played the role of a battle-ground for national and racial conflicts, and it is the traditional home and breeding-place of national minorities. The English-speaking civilization, on the other hand, has been the traditional melting-pot of many nations and races, all of which have contributed to its greatness and all of which have an equal claim on its hospitality.

Europe has been suffering from a congestion of men and nationalities which has resulted in a violent pressure on the economic resources. In this atmosphere of economic suffocation and overcrowding the Jews have been an excellent

target for popular hate and jealousy. In the Anglo-Saxon world the spaces are wider, and the economic resources are more plentiful; the blood of the civilization is rich; its horizon is wide and its outlook tolerant. It has great national riches, not only on land but on the seas. Its ships ply across the oceans of the world and its men inhale the fresh breeze of the sea. The Jew, too, has been able to have a share in the great opportunities open to all. Throughout the centuries Europe has been fighting bitter ideological wars inspired by fanaticism and dogmatism. Fanaticism and dogmatism mean persecution and persecution means an exodus of refugees; refugees have been one of the most important exports of Europe. In the English-speaking world, on the other hand, the spirit of fair play and sportsmanship has made these countries the traditional host of refugees from religious and political persecution. In Europe Anti-Semitism is organically endemic. In the Anglo-Saxon countries it is a mild epidemic of influenza which is never really serious.

In England and America Jews can reasonably expect to become integrated in the national life of the country concerned. Integration should not mean assimilation and imitation. Jews who consciously try to become "more English than the English" and more American than the Americans are never liked. Once a Jew always a Jew is a maxim in which Jews should take pride.

Welshmen are members of the British people and are yet intensely proud of their language and cultural heritage. Similarly loyalty to their adopted land should not mean the diminution of love and sympathy to the religious and cultural heritage of the race, nor diminution of interest and help to the cause of Zionism in which the English-speaking Jews have an historic mission to fulfil.

Germany and the Jews

The gravity of the position of the Jews on the European continent can be illustrated by Germany—the classical land of theoretical anti-Semitism. After 1870 there grew in the

German-speaking lands of Europe an extensive anti-Semitic literature associated with names like Wilhelm Marr, Professor Treitschke, Stocker, and Karl Lueger. The primitive instincts of hate and aversion of the Germanic tribes were cultivated by half-crazy intellectuals, unscrupulous agitators and pseudo-scientists.

It is impossible to exaggerate the effect of this literature on Europe as a whole, as it is impossible to exaggerate the role played by French intellectuals in the liberation and emancipation of the Jew. And just as at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century France was *la grande nation*, so it was Germany which later became the leading industrial and military nation on the Continent. The heart of Europe was stirred by emotions of cruelty and evil, and the insanity spread to neighbouring countries which could not resist the magnetism of a big neighbour.

It is significant that all the great heroes of the Germans have not been free from anti-Semitism. Frederick the Great, Bismarck, to say nothing of the man who describes himself as "the greatest German in history", have all displayed hostility to the Jews. It is even more significant that a great religious and popular leader like Martin Luther should have contracted the poisonous disease at the end of his days.

Hitler—an expert on political pathology—grasped the weakness of the Jewish position in Europe and determined to exploit it as a stepping-stone to power. To what extent the acute Jewish problem in Central Europe served him as the back on which he rode to power is a controversial point.

Hermann Rauschning in *Hitler Speaks* points out that Hitler attaches the greatest importance to the Jewish bogey. It is the physical embodiment of "the enemy", without which Hitlerism cannot thrive.

V. Jabotinsky (whose *The Jewish War Front** is perhaps the best analysis of the Jewish problem in Europe since the publication of *The Jewish State* by Herzl), says: "The world

* London: George Allen & Unwin.

outside Germany does not realize to what an extent the Nazi movement has depended, through all the twenty years of its existence, on the hatred of the Jew for its vitality and driving power. . . . Some of these Nazi chiefs have been quite credibly reported as confessing how 'utterly fed-up' they were with the necessity of talking always of Jews, Jews, Jews. . . . The Jewish tragedy is, of course, not the microbe which has caused this war. It is only the cultural medium in which the microbe has grown to maturity."

The malady of Germany has considerably affected the health and equilibrium of the whole continent. When the waves of the Nazi revolution have spent themselves and when they inevitably begin to roll back, it will be found that the damage has already been done and that it is almost irreparable. Just as the retreat of the French armies at the beginning of the last century did not, in the long run, affect Jewish emancipation, so the retreat of German soldiery will not affect the historical process of Jewish disintegration in Europe.

Poland and the Jews⁶

The fundamental facts about the Jews in Poland are as follows: (1) Historically the Jews have fulfilled the function of a middle class. Even before the establishment of the Polish Republic the Poles resented a state of affairs in which such an important role was played by an alien race. Hence the attempts made by the Poles, particularly after the establishment of the Republic, to dislodge the Jews from their traditional place in Polish economic life. (2) The Jews in Poland are a distinct community, with their own language, dress, culture, and institutions. The Polish attitude to this fact was summed up in the words of a Polish patriot: "There cannot be room for two nations on the banks of the Vistula." (3) The Jews constitute a very important proportion of the population, i.e. 3½ millions or 10 per cent of the population of the Polish Republic. It is scattered throughout the land

and varies in intensity in each region. (4) It cannot be asserted that the Polish people possesses sufficient strength, economic or cultural, to swallow another nation, or that it has the digestive capacities of countries like the United States or England.

Assimilation should not be entirely disregarded as a solution even by ardent Zionists, but to be effective assimilation can function only in very rare and favourable circumstances. Historically it has been shown that only where Jews form an insignificant minority and where the non-Jewish population is tolerant and strong enough to accept them, can assimilation work and even then it may fail. For the main body of Jewry, and particularly for Polish Jewry, wholesale assimilation is an impracticable proposition.

National and cultural autonomy is another view which has had wide support, particularly after the last war. Dubnov, a distinguished Jewish historian, was the champion of a secular nationalism based not on Palestine but on the creation of autonomous Jewish centres in the Diaspora. His idea was part of a general philosophy of national and cultural autonomy for minorities.

The Bund, the formation of which coincided with that of political Zionism, demanded the recognition of Yiddish as the national language, and complete national autonomy for the Jews. It was opposed both to territorialism and Zionism, and in the Polish Republic waged a continuous war with Jewish employers. Recently the exiled leaders of the Polish Bund submitted a memorandum to representatives of the exiled Polish Government which says: "We have always remained faithful to our socialist solution of co-operation and brotherhood between nations. We have never said—as Polish and Jewish nationalists did—that all Jews, regardless of social position, are brothers and that all Poles are enemies of the Jews. We have never made the Polish people responsible for the acts of violence and the persecution of the Jews. We have never identified the anti-Semitic reaction with the Polish people in Poland. . . .

"Our active participation in the struggle for the existence of Poland is not due to the fact that Hitlerism is hostile to the Jewish people or to our dislike of Fascism, but it is the expression of our attachment to the land whose liberty is a condition for the liberty of all its citizens. . . .

"We, the largest Jewish party, have concentrated all our activities in Poland and for Poland only. To the propagandist incitement of certain sections of the Polish people, to the nationalist dreams of the Zionists and to Jewish and Polish territorialists we said yesterday—and we say today—that Poland is our Fatherland. In Poland we lived for generations and with Poland we share—and shall share—its destiny. We are against all attempts to find a new home for the Jewish masses of Poland. We would like to fight on with Polish masses for the liberation of our only home and a just reconstruction of life in our only home."

Experience, however, has shown how difficult the application of such a policy is. At the last Peace Conference representatives of the Jewish Community of Europe and America were anxious that the rights of minorities should be an international obligation protected by the organs of the League. The principle of equal civil and political rights for minorities and of special protection of religious freedom and cultural autonomy was embodied in the treaties between the principal Allied Powers on the one hand and Poland (and other European States) on the other.

Things did not work well at all. Briand said that the Allied aim was to create "a kind of a small family within a larger family". This description is apt enough if one considers the family quarrels which ensued.

Paderewski denounced the minority treaty as an infringement of sovereignty, while the Jews talked of unfulfilled obligations and discriminations. "The treaty", says a Polish professor, "opened up a fertile ground for quarrels about legislative and administrative problems. . . ." Demands were made for much extended privileges of self-government as no sovereign State could ever grant to a minority, and one scat-

tered all over the country too—demands which, in fact, frequently amounted to what would have been in Mr. Morgenthau's words "the creation of a Jewish State within the Polish State".

Both Janowsky and Macartney stress the fact that the two main architects of the idea of minority rights after the last war were the Anglo-Saxons (who wished to implant their conception of liberalism and tolerance in Europe), and the Jews (who by virtue of their peculiar position in Europe and their accessibility to Allied Statesmen played an important part in its evolution).

Events proved that Anglo-Saxon liberalism is suitable for more or less homogeneous states and not for countries where the racial composition is in a chaotic state, and that the Jews failed to realize where their true interests lay.

The man who clearly understood the fragility of the Jewish structure in Europe was Jabotinsky. He went to the Jewish masses in Poland and saw their sufferings. He also went to the Polish authorities and saw their difficulties. He knew a volcano when he saw one. He came back with the phrase which is already part and parcel of the Zionist vocabulary. What undermines the Jewish position in Poland and elsewhere, he declared, was not the "anti-Semitism of men but of things". During his visit a Galician Rabbi said to him, "I wonder, if I were king, just how much I should be able to do to improve the lot of the Jews in this blessed country. It does not depend so entirely on what orders you give, nor on how many hooligans you put in gaol. It is more like the falling of the rain and snow."

He talked with the ruling class of Poland—the disciples of Pilsudski, and this is his view of them: "None of them pretended to be a lover of the Jews—though we should seek in vain, amongst our sincerest well-wishers in Europe, for any such intimate intuition as theirs, derived from centuries of close proximity to the Jews *Weltanschauung* to the atmosphere of the Jewish home and the Jewish soul. But it would be hardly exact to class them as political

anti-Semites. As acutely as their teacher, Pilsudski, they felt and feared the degrading, besmirching vulgarity of pogroms in the streets and pogrom-like pages on the statute book. But they had to face a host of elemental forces within the country, pressing for anti-Jewish legislation and breaking out into murderous riots. There were moments after Pilsudski's death when the only barrier left between the Jews and the crusade of all against the Jews was the Government and the small controlling group which supported it—the Pilsudski clique, commonly known as 'The Colonels', a group small in number and isolated, with no proper roots in any social stratum of importance. The Colonels tried to stem the general clamour for brutal Nazi methods by offering a more dignified alternative; they sponsored efforts towards preparing an orderly scheme of voluntary mass-evacuation, in Geneva they intervened for more extensive immigration into Palestine and they encouraged various projects of Jewish settlements in Australia and Madagascar. Many Jews who knew them would vouch for the sincerity of these attempts, though they could wish that they had been ten times as wholehearted and forcible. But the relevant fact is that the onslaught which they sought to ward off was an offensive of formidable intensity, backed by members of all classes and resisted by a few of any class; it was truly 'elemental', truly 'a crusade of all against the Jews.'"

So much for the past. The future will probably see the further growth of étatism, which will make the existence of a national minority a very difficult one. Many Jewish leaders nowadays no longer talk of national rights in Europe but confine themselves to the demand for civil rights. What use will the Jews make of their civil rights is another question. One thing, however, is clear. They will not be able to eat them.

Up to the moment of writing, more than eight out of the ten million Jews in Europe have passed through Hitler's New Order. In Nazi occupied territories and Allied coun-

tries, Jews have been removed from the economic life and congregated into ghettos where they are lucky to obtain bread and soup to keep body and soul together. They lost their jobs, their businesses and their factories, and have been replaced by non-Jews, Germans at the top but mainly by Hungarians, Roumanians, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Ukrainians, and White Russians. Does anyone imagine that after the war all the Gentiles will be dismissed to make room for the Jews? One can see the absurdity of the belief expressed in some quarters that Jews will be among the "builders of a new Europe." For the great bulk of the Jews physical survival will be identical with emigration.

The Jewish Exodus

There are two questions which Jews should ask themselves once they are convinced of the need for a large-scale migration. First, what is the formula which is most likely to serve the interests of the Jewish people? What is the right approach to the problem? The policy of evacuation advocated by the Revisionists suffers from over-simplification. Its contribution to Zionism has been a matter of education rather than of statesmanship. It was designed to draw the attention of the Jews and the non-Jews to the existence of a grave malady and the need for a radical solution.

The policy of wholesale evacuation may become a necessity and if it does, the strain imposed on Zionism will be great and such a burden should not be lightly undertaken. The Jews, while admitting the need for a withdrawal on a large scale, should not help to transform the withdrawal into a general rout. The bargaining power of the Jews will be adversely affected, if the negotiations with the European Powers are conducted on the assumption that the Jews are unwanted guests to be cleared out at any cost. The Jews cannot afford to concede beforehand the anti-Semitic point of view.

The element of compulsion involved is also repugnant both to the Jews and to the Anglo-Saxon spirit. There may

be a considerable number of assimilated Jews who are only technically Jews but who wish to become and are accepted as fully fledged citizens of the countries of their birth. There are also Jews who because of lack of training and age will only become a burden to the struggling Jewish State, and may be in a position to find means of existence in the countries where they live. Zionism, as Herzl emphasized, is a solution for Jews who are unable or unwilling to live in their native lands and this must still be the guiding principle of Zionism.

Further, it is also a dangerous principle to proclaim. Anti-Semitism is an infectious disease and can even cross the Atlantic. Such a policy can serve as a precedent to other countries where Jews are generally accepted as equal members of the State and where they enjoy conditions of life which they are unwilling to forgo. The Jews cannot of their own free will endorse a policy of official anti-Semitism; it is contrary to their interest, honour, and moral principles.

But while the Jewish people must beware of accepting rash formulas, and has to counter them by a sounder Zionist strategy, it must press its leaders for a more positive, dynamic and radical policy in keeping with the trend of the age and with its long-range interests.

Those who advocate evacuation and those who oppose it would be better employed in seeking points of contact rather than of difference. It is surprising how many and fundamental are the points on which there is a general consensus of opinion and how few and unimportant are the points of divergence.

"Compulsion" is a case in point. To a large extent the controversy over it is verbal and meaningless. No matter what formula is adopted, it will be subordinated to and modified by the realities of European life. If the Jews and the European States can reach an agreement that there should be no compulsion in the transfer of Jews, and these States put pressure on the Jews and organize their whole national life and resources in such a manner as to make Jewish life impossible there, it will also amount to com-

pulsion. On the other hand, if certain States welcome Jews to be members of the community, Zionists will not be able to make these Jews emigrate against their will.

A wise people makes wise formulas, but it has also to face fundamental facts and the fundamental facts are that the bulk of the Jews in the anti-Semitic zones of Europe are on the verge of divorce on the ground of incompatibility.

I think that most Jews, with the exception of the Bundists, assimilationists, and some of the more timid of the Zionists, will agree on a programme which involves a large-scale migration to a Jewish State in Palestine, the forgoing of national rights in the Diaspora, insistence on civil rights for Jews who cannot or will not go to Palestine, and negotiations with the European nations and international authorities with a view to concluding agreements on transfer of property, compensation, and the re-training and re-education of the Jewish masses and particularly of the Jewish youth in the Diaspora for life in Palestine.

The second question is whether the Zionist solution of transfer of population is one which is in keeping with the trend of world statesmanship. After the last war the minority problem was tackled by the method of moving frontiers in accordance with the principle of self-determination. It was unsuccessful to start with, as no map drawn could eliminate large minorities. As years went by the existence of such minorities became a disturbing factor to the health of Europe. In fact, the existence of such minorities in Czechoslovakia and Poland precipitated the greatest war of all times. Today, there is a general reaction against the timidity and policy of half-measures adopted by the statesmen after the last war. A more far-reaching solution will have to be found if the world really means to remove the causes of unrest and war and to create a stable Europe. This can only be achieved by the moving of population in substitution of, or in addition to, the moving of frontiers.

When a European statesman like Edward Beneš, who belongs to the liberal and democratic school and who is at the

head of a State which was a model to the whole world in its treatment of minorities, comes out in support of the principle of the transfer of populations, it is obvious that the world is moving very fast to the more radical point of view.

"The problem of national minorities", says Dr. Beneš, "will have to be considered far more systematically and radically than it was after the last war. I accept the principle of the transfer of populations. Populations were exchanged successfully and on a large scale, between Greece and Turkey after the war of 1922. The world courageously accepted this large-scale transfer, because it knew that the alternative would have been a systematic, mass murder of millions of people. If the problem is carefully considered and wide measures are adopted in good time, the transfer can be made amicably under decent, human conditions, under international control and with international support "

If the movement of populations is the key to the minority problem of Europe, Zionism is the key to the Jewish problem. It is to the credit of Zionism that for more than half a century it has been anticipating such a course and for more than half a century it has been working on the organization of a national migration.

Its small rate of progress after the last war was largely due, among other things, to the fact that world statesmanship was not then ripe for a surgical operation in Europe. When it does become ripe for it, the rhythm of Zionism will be tremendously accelerated.

IN SEARCH OF TERRITORY

(i) *Early Experiments*

Most of us have asked ourselves at one time or another: Why is it that the Jews, the most persecuted race on earth, were not alive to the possibility of colonization when other nations about four hundred years ago started to settle overseas? Why is it that the most homeless people in the world did not seize the opportunities which were created after the discovery of the New World and the opening of the sea-routes to the East?

The answer to these questions was given by Moses Mendelssohn in the year 1770, when a friend put before him a project for the establishment of a Jewish State. He refused to entertain the project on the ground that the oppression under which Jews had been living for so many centuries had robbed their spirit of all vigour, that they were too scattered to work in common, that the project would cost too much money, and that it would need the general consent of the Great Powers of Europe.

To these considerations others may be added. Before the period of emancipation at the end of the eighteenth century the Jews were completely dominated by religious and Messianic ideals which were centred on Palestine, and which excluded any other territory. Even the restoration of the Jews to Palestine was envisaged as a supernatural act preceded by the appearance of the Redeemer. Any collective effort at organization of colonization was considered as an effort to hurry God, who would send the Messiah in His own good time.

Moreover, the colonizing nations were, of course, backed by their own Governments. It is no accident that the successful colonists were those who belonged to nations which had first attained a higher degree of unity and cohesion, i.e. the Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, French, and English. The

Germans and the Italians, who were disunited, were left out and so were the Jews.

Jews, however, as individuals were not unaware of the opportunities in the New World and elsewhere. There are on record a large number of projects of colonization and some actual experiments.

As early as the year 1652 a tract of land in the island of Curaçao under the authority of the Dutch West India Company, was put at the disposal of Joseph Nunez da Fonseca and others to found a colony for the Jews in that island. The attempt ended in failure. In 1654 a project was formed for the settlement in Surnam, then a British Colony. In 1659 a grant was made by the French West Indies to a Portuguese Jew authorizing him to found a Jewish colony in Cayenne.

In the year 1656 James Harrington, the English political philosopher, advocated in his *Oceana* the return of the Jews to the soil as in Biblical times and their wholesale transportation to . . . Ireland.

In 1819 an Englishman, Robinson, suggested the establishment of a Jewish colony in Mississippi, but being an owner of large tracts of land in that district, he was suspected of furthering his own ends.

In 1749 Marshal de Saxe, the natural son of August II, the King of Poland, toyed with the idea of establishing a Jewish State in South America with himself as King. "He took a fancy to become a King and on looking around found all the thrones occupied. He cast his eye upon that nation which for seventeen hundred years had neither sovereign nor country, which was everywhere dispersed and everywhere a stranger. . . . It is not known how far the Jews co-operated with him nor was his plan ever developed: but the project was well known to the world and his friends joked with him on the subject."

The best known experiment in the early part of the nineteenth century is that of Mordecai Emmanuel Noah (1785-1851). After a career of journalism in the United

States he was appointed United States Consul in Tunis. His experiences there made him a "Zionist". Since he realized that a Jewish State in Palestine was impractical, he decided to establish an autonomous Jewish settlement in America. He selected an island near the city of Buffalo and named it Ararat. In 1825 he published in American and European papers a call to the Jews of the world to settle there. He appointed himself as leader and lawgiver and urged the Jews to abide by his rules and declarations, and at the same time accept the protection of the American flag. The scheme was almost universally ridiculed and there was no Jewish response to his appeal. This did not prevent Noah from staging a celebration to lay the corner-stone of the colony. In September 1825 a procession took place which consisted of clergymen, some Federal officials, a small contingent of local soldiers and local negroes. Speeches were made and the band played, but the scheme did not proceed any further.

(ii) *Modern Territorialism*

The next stage in the development of the movement is reached at the time of the Russian pogroms in the year 1881. The Jews were seized by mass hysteria and they made frantic efforts to find new homes.

The events of those days gave birth to two parallel movements, Zionism and territorialism. Both agreed on the analysis of the Jewish malady, but the former aimed at the "establishing for the Jewish people a publicly and legally secured home in Palestine" (Basic Programme), while the latter sought "to procure territory upon an autonomous basis for those Jews who cannot or will not remain in the lands in which they at present live" (Zangwill).

It is noteworthy that at its birth political Zionism was territorialist in character. Pinsker, in his *Auto-emancipation*, had an open mind on the issue. He suggested that the selection of the appropriate territory should be made by a committee of competent experts. Herzl at first hesitated,

and in the *Jewish State* he put the question—"Palestine or Argentina?"

The authors of political Zionism were at first prepared to leave the choice of a future home to the Jews themselves, but both Pinsker and Herzl, in face of the pressure of the Jewish masses, were compelled to abandon their original attitude.

The difficulties which the Zionists encountered in their negotiations with the Sultan later led to the revival of territorialism in the Zionist leadership. Herzl was sick of "Ali Baba and his Forty Thieves" and the Oriental intrigues and turned to the English Government for help. Contacts were established and a promise was given that El Arish in the Sinai Peninsula would be available for Jewish colonization (1902). "But the scheme did not hold water", since the Egyptian Government refused to allow irrigation from the Nile. The Uganda proposal associated with the name of Joseph Chamberlain met with a similar fate. It was approved by the Sixth Zionist Congress, 1903, on the ground that it provided a *Nachtayl* but it aroused such a storm of opposition in the Zionist world that the Seventh Zionist Congress in 1905 rejected the offer.

The Seventh Congress saw the secession of the Uganda supporters and the forming of the Ito, the Jewish territorial organization under the leadership of Israel Zangwill.

Explaining the aim of the movement Israel Zangwill said: "Ito sprang into existence to meet the vital needs of the masses of the Jewish People.

"Russian Jews have realized that there is absolutely no hope for this in Russia itself, and the stream of immigration into other lands threatened to become an overwhelming flood before which the largest hearted philanthropy must be reduced to helplessness.

"Hitherto the established policy—in so far as there was any policy or control—has been to break up the stream of emigration and to find openings in the great industrial civilizations of the West. But the Western countries, wisely

or unwisely, have taken alarm and are calling a halt to this advance of alien power

"The Ito aims at obtaining a large tract of territory (preferably within the British Empire) wherein to found a great Jewish Home of Refuge (1905)

"The Ito has always declared its readiness to co-operate in developing Palestine if the Zionists could guarantee the political safeguards But, to borrow a resolution passed in a Russian synagogue—the Ito cannot consent to tie the fate of the Jewish People to a territory whose acquisition is uncertain" (1907)

In London a committee of experts was formed and a search for territory was begun The Ito put in a claim to Uganda but the East African offer had in the meantime been withdrawn Zangwill bitterly talked of "lost opportunities" "A century ago we could have the pick in three continents Nay, only threequarters of a century ago a Jew named Nathaniel Isaacs having worked for a Zulu king was granted a large territory with the title of 'Chief of Natal'."

In 1907 the territorialists met in London and examined various schemes of colonization in Canada, Argentina, Australia, Africa and Asia In 1908 a group of experts was sent to Cyrenaica in which Jewish history goes back to classical times, but the report was an adverse one. In 1909 the territorialists pinned their faith on Iraq, the cradle of the Jewish race and the land of the Talmud Their enthusiasm was soon cooled as the attitude of the Turkish Government became known

The organization then turned its attention to the regulation of Jewish immigration into America. They attempted to divert Jewish mass immigration from the congested Eastern States, particularly from New York to the Southern and Western States They therefore organized parties of Jewish immigrants in European ports and landed them at Galveston in the South

Its last preoccupation was with Angola in Portuguese West Africa. Both the Portuguese Government and Parlia-

ment were favourable to the scheme of Jewish colonization in Angola and a report of the commission under Professor Gregory of the University of Glasgow was also encouraging. Nothing came of the plan, partly because the Jews were sceptical and lukewarm (they were required, for example, to become Portuguese subjects and to learn the Portuguese language), and partly because of the outbreak of war when the project was indefinitely postponed.

At the time of the Balfour Declaration Zangwill became more closely associated with Zionism and the Ito was ultimately disbanded.

The events of 1881 proved also a decisive turning point for a great philanthropist associated with Jewish colonization, Baron M. Hirsch. He had a considerable fortune and was determined to make the Jewish people his sole heir.

At first he thought that he could solve the Jewish distress in Russia by a programme of re-training and re-education, but later he realized that the malady was much more fundamental and began therefore to investigate the possibilities of emigration and settlement in the New World. In the year 1891 he founded the Jewish Colonization Association which aimed at promoting the emigration and settlement of Jews from countries in which Jews were subject to disabilities.

The best known enterprise of the association is the Jewish colonization in the Argentina. When it was launched great hopes were entertained. There was talk of settling a million Jews and there is no doubt that the Baron had in mind a mass migration which would ease the unrest in Europe.

These extravagant hopes have not been justified by events. There are in Argentina today about fifteen settlements with a Jewish population of about 20,000 out of a total Jewish population of between 250,000 and 300,000. Though reports and rumours which are periodically received in this country about the disintegration of the colonies (due to the flight to towns and to the sale of holdings to non-Jews) may be

exaggerated, it is true to say that the colonization has for some considerable time made little progress.

In any case the Hirsch colonies in Argentina cannot, strictly speaking, be regarded as territorialism. There is no "autonomous basis" and the Jewish agricultural population is scattered, each colony being "as far from the other as London from Paris" The colonies, it is said, lack the magnet of a political future, and their sons too often succumb to the "charms of Buenos Aires"

Biro-Bidjan

Jewish colonization in Soviet Russia is outstanding for two facts. It has a long history behind it, as it began at the dawn of the nineteenth century as a result of the policy of the Russian enlightened despotism. Secondly, it still has the largest farming population in the Jewish world. About 250,000 Jews were engaged in agriculture in the whole of the Soviet Union before the present war. Moreover, the quality of the Jewish farmers in Russia is very high. Observers agree that they are more intelligent and employ better scientific methods than their neighbours.

The policy of the Bolsheviks has been to encourage Jewish settlement on the land in order to ensure "the productivization" of the Jew and the preservation of his culture. There have been two attempts to create Jewish autonomous regions. The first one was the projected establishment of a Jewish Republic in the Crimea which was launched in 1924, and abandoned in 1928 owing to the opposition of the native population. The second attempt is the well-known Republic of Biro-Bidjan, initiated in 1928 and declared a Jewish autonomous region in 1934. The information about Biro-Bidjan is meagre and contradictory, but from it it can be gathered that the region failed to attract the Jewish masses and that the number of failures is considerable.

(iii) *The Revival of Territorialism*

The upheaval caused by the Nazi Revolution and the steady deterioration in the Jewish position in Eastern Europe have again brought the question of territorialism to the fore.

The most interesting feature of this tendency in the great interest shown by Governments.

In 1936 the Polish Press began to display lively interest in the island of Madagascar as an outlet for the surplus Jewish population of that country. A commission was sent to investigate conditions, but its report was unsavourable and then, all of a sudden, the whole matter was dropped.

When Italy adopted the anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist policy there was a sudden revival of interest in the Madagascar project. The Italian propagandists took over the idea from the Polish Press and began to talk of the island as the future home of the Jewish Race. Not only the Jews of Italy and Palestine but "18,000,000 Jews" from all over the world were to be accommodated there. "Then the Christians would stop persecuting the Jews and the Jewish people would evolve its own civilization."

The attitude of the Nazi propagandists varies considerably. Sometimes they support the Italian plans of creating a Jewish State in Africa; sometimes they persist in talking of the segregation of the Jews in the Lublin area. But apparently these solutions are far too humane for the Nazi experts and the most up-to-date utterances envisage the wholesale transportation of Jews to Africa and their dispersion in the most forsaken and inhospitable corners of that continent under the supervision of Aryan police. To call this idea of Jewish reservations in Africa a territorialist solution is a travesty. It is a policy of extermination, disguised in less objectionable terms.

In 1938 the British Government announced that 10,000 square miles would be available for refugees from Nazi oppression in British Guiana and in May 1939 the Advisory Committee on Political Refugees appointed by President

Roosevelt published a report on conditions there. Its main conclusion was that the territory was not ideal for colonization. It nevertheless recommended a trial settlement of 5,000 pioneers to take place within two years and at the cost of \$3,000,000.

It was obvious even to the casual observer that the British Government was actuated by at least two important motives. The first one was the cry raised by public opinion that the British Empire with its vast territories ought to do something for the outcasts of Europe. There was a feeling of shame that the greatest Empire in the world was doing nothing for these unfortunates. In the second place, the British Government was at the end of 1938 and at the beginning of 1939 contemplating the abandonment of political Zionism, and it was considered wise to soothe the Jews and their friends by pointing to an alternative scheme. Some M.P.s were quite frank; they wanted a Jewish State in British Guiana to take the place of Palestine.

In July 1941 Lord Moyne, the Colonial Secretary, in a Colonial Office debate in the House of Lords, admitted that he was not impressed with the prospects of settling Jews in British Guiana.

The last five years have seen considerable growth of neoterritorialism among private persons and organizations. A number of individuals have made it their hobby to interview officials and ministers of various Governments and to return to their homes, in most cases the United States, with the news of the discovery of a new territory. There is hardly a Republic in South America which has not been colonized by Jews . . . on paper.

The best known territorialist society today is "the Free-land League for Territorial Colonization" headed by Dr. A. Steinberg.

Dr. Steinberg went to Australia and had a considerable amount of success in persuading Australian newspapers and politicians of the desirability of opening up the Kimberleys in North-West Australia to Jewish colonization. He

skillfully played on their fears of Japanese ambitions and had a large section of public opinion behind his scheme.

The Australians, nevertheless, are apprehensive and sceptical. They fear that the Jews will not be able to stand conditions there and will migrate to the towns. In Australia there is a tradition of salutes congregating in the big towns, and if British and Australian pioneers often could not make good, what can you expect of urban and intellectual Jews?

A characteristic reaction to Steinberg's activities in Australia can be obtained from an outspoken article in the *Australian Quarterly Review*, March 1930. "The request for a ghetto state to be created in the barren North-West of Australia . . . would amount to geographical as well as ethnographical segregation but it would amount also in essence, to a request for cession of part of our territory to another sovereignty—a successful alien invasion, without a war. Alternately, if the proposed Jewish colony is to be planted under the Australian Constitution, then its implied basis of racial segregation and particular privilege is contrary to the fundamentals of Australian bio-political and social-political organizations; and as such will never be tolerated by the Australians."

(iv) *The Territorialist Illusion*

If one compares the record of Zionism with that of territorialism one immediately realizes that territorialism has been one of the most barren movements in Jewish history. Zionism has solid achievements to its credit. It has succeeded in laying the foundations of a Jewish Homeland. "The only service that the territorialist movement did for the Jews was", says S. Levin, "that several leaders became good geographers."

Zionism successfully tackled the greatest dilemma of a tragic nation, i.e. that of seeking contact with the earth. Territorialism was floating and is still floating in the void.

Zionists are not really afraid of territorialism and are therefore not jealous of it. They have acquired a healthy

scepticism based on a long experience. They merely deplore the waste involved in the diversion of the national attention and national energy to wrong paths.

They are convinced that the possibility of creating a genuine Jewish State in one of the world's empty spaces is remote. There are no such things as empty spaces. The habitable globe is either sparsely or densely populated. Lands are under the control of nations who would not of their own free will, and whom it would be difficult to compel, part with their right of sovereignty. The El Arish, Uganda, British Guiana proposals all offered only a limited autonomy, with the same complications and difficulties which have been found in Palestine.

"The British conception of Zionism" (as stated by *The Times* after the White Paper of 1939) advocating the creation of Jewish autonomous communities throughout the world, is based on a misconception of the motives and aims of Zionism.

The vulnerability of the Jewish people is due to their being scattered throughout the world, forming everywhere small minorities, which are, in the last resort, defenceless. It is this dispersion which Zionism tries to counter by the principle of concentration and regards any attempt to destroy this principle with suspicion. Herzl said, "What is achieved by transporting a few thousand Jews to another country? Either they come to grief at once or prosper and their prosperity creates anti-Semitism. We have already discussed these attempts to divert Jews to fresh districts. This diversion is clearly futile, if it does not defeat its own ends, for it merely protracts and postpones a solution and perhaps even aggravates the difficulties."

To the contention that the British are also scattered and are yet in a comparatively strong position, the answer is that the backbone of the British Empire is England. Without England, the Empire would have been inconceivable. Yet Jews are urged to build an "empire" without its mainstay and source of strength. Whether the Jew will in the

distant future build an empire, remains to be seen, though personally I believe that the Jews will never entertain such ambitions. But they will certainly not be so mad as to create daughter colonies first and a mother country afterwards.

Some English politicians and writers insist that such a course is necessary in order to divert the "intolerable pressure" from Palestine elsewhere. This is bad strategy. The secret of the success of Zionism in face of so many obstacles and powerful enemies lies in the fact that it has brought extreme pressure to bear on one point. The weakness of territorialism, on the other hand, has been dissipation of energy and lack of concentration.

Then there is history. The Jewish national memory stretches back to the dawn of the ancient world, and the Jews are what they are because of certain forces and events. In the course of their history the Jews acquired what Weizmann describes as an organic attachment to Palestine which they cannot break and which is part of them. Is it conceivable that such a people could deny history and break off with the past? Their most vivid national characteristic, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, is the gift of vision. They apprehend things not through logic and beauty—these are the gifts of the Greeks—but through intuition. The Bible is the expression of the workings of our soul. Can they completely ignore the vision of the prophets and their message of restoration? Can they be entirely indifferent to mysticism and religion?

Some people who do not share these emotions and experiences demand a rational explanation of their attitude. To them they say that this vision of theirs is neither irrational nor arbitrary. It has strong elements of shrewdness and common sense behind it.

Every great venture in the history of the human race required a spiritual impulse. To found a new State or a new society, suffering is not enough. Hunger must be united with an ideal and distress must be combined with religion.

The seeds of such a spiritual and religious message take a long time to germinate and to influence the minds of people. This is more so in the case of a disembodied, wounded, and scattered people like the Jews.

Zionist propaganda does not date from 1917 or 1897 or even 1832. It is as old as the Bible and it has been so powerful as to send sons of urban and intellectual Jews to a neglected and impoverished Turkish province and made them fight, work and die there. How can a movement like territorialism succeed if its seeds have not yet even begun to be sown in the hearts of the Jewish people?

Moreover, it is not only the Jews who are under consideration. Jewish destiny lies in Jewish hands, but it cannot be accomplished without the help or goodwill of the English-speaking world. The strength of Jewish friendship with the Anglo-Saxons lies in their common heritage—the Bible. The ideals of the Prophets and of the Restoration are as much part of Anglo-Saxon life as of Jewish life. English clergymen wrote pamphlets on Zionism long before Moses Hess and Leo Pinsker.

The Bible has been "the Jewish State on the way", and this idea has been impressed not only on the Jewish but also on the Christian world. Hence, to most Gentile Zionists, territorialism is meaningless while Palestine is an organic part of their outlook and upbringing.

Above all there is the factor of time. Colonization is an extremely slow process. The pioneering stage in Palestine lasted for about fifty years, and throughout the whole phase progress was extremely and desperately slow. It is only in the last ten years that the period of acceleration has taken place. In the last ten years the Jewish population in Palestine increased three times more than in the whole previous fifty years of colonization taken together. Can the Jews wait until a new scheme of colonization matures and gathers strength? Can they wait fifty years? Can they wait ten years?

Palestine presents innumerable difficulties, but once these difficulties are out of the way there will be ample compen-

sation for the Zionist trail of suffering. Palestine is unique in its geographical position, being the meeting point of East and West, of three continents and a vital centre of communications.

A Zionist leader in a conversation with Field-Marshal Smuts once remarked, half in earnest and half in jest, that Moses had made a big mistake when he had led the children of Israel to the land of Canaan instead of to South Africa—the land of gold and plenty. To which the South African replied that he believed Moses had been right, because Jews were always unhappy and restless when confined to the peripheries of civilization and at their best when in the midst of things.

PART II

**ON THE STAGE OF WORLD
HISTORY**

THE JEW MEETS THE GREAT CONQUERORS

ONE of the most striking themes of the Jewish prophets and Apocalypticists is the rise and fall of empires, the march of huge armies, the succession of ambitious conquerors, and the ultimate triumph of the spirit of God and justice. The stories of the great conquerors are thus regarded as abortive experiments to establish universal and permanent systems of government. Though doomed to failure the attempts are regarded as a necessary preparation for the final world peace and unity of mankind which will be established in the fulness of time.

Alexander the Great was the first of the series of the great conquerors. He made an enormous impression on the Jews and won their admiration and gratitude. His influence over them is claimed to have been greater than that of any other non-Jew.

Before his arrival in Palestine the Jews were an obscure people—a small and poor community of shepherds and peasants. They certainly thought a great deal of themselves, and no doubt the appearance in their midst of prophets and visionaries made them unique, but they were hardly regarded as the Chosen Race by their neighbours. What comparison could there be between this ragged community of shepherds and peasants with the mighty empires of the Nile, Euphrates, and Tigris? Indeed, to the students of ancient Israel, the poverty of reference to them in the contemporary records of the Ancient World is rather embarrassing.

Alexander took them out of the narrow groove of exclusive tribalism and made them members of a great civilization. Since then the Jews have been "men of the world", and in the midst of things. Josephus's story of the meeting between Alexander and the High Priest of Jerusalem and of the homage paid by the conqueror to the Jewish representative may or may not have been a fact,

but it is symbolic of the coming of age of the Jewish people. There was something in common between Alexander and the Jew. It was a sincere friendship between a man on the lookout for new worlds to conquer and a people destined to traverse all the corners of the earth. The privileges granted to the Jews, the recognition by the Jews of "Alexander" as a Jewish name, the Alexander stories in the Talmudic literature point out the existence of real sympathy and affinity between conqueror and the conquered.

Alexander is known to history as the greatest city builder of all times, and the Jews formed a considerable proportion of the inhabitants of the new Hellenistic cities. In Alexandria, for example, two out of the five districts of the city were occupied by Jews and Jewish sources tell glowing stories of the numbers, wealth, and organization of the Jewish community in the metropolis of the Diaspora. Alexandria was virtually the New York of the ancient world, and although the Jewish Diaspora had already been in existence, Alexander can be described as the real creator of the Diaspora.

Alexander internationalized trade and opened up new commercial routes. The Jews, who up to that time were primarily an agricultural people, began their commercial career. Josephus could rightly say of Palestine and Palestinian Jews that they were not a commercial people, that they lived in a country without a seaboard and that they had no inclination for trade. It was no longer true of Egyptian Jewry and other Jewish centres of Hellenistic civilization.

Alexander brought East and West together and the Jews, living at the meeting-place of three continents, proved to be able intermediaries between the culture of the Europeans and the Orientals. Hellenism and Judaism at once fascinated and repelled each other but their meeting was a momentous event. Both the rise of Christianity and the entrance of the Jew into the orbit of European civilization can be traced to it.

Alexander's Empire, however, though it substituted the idea of "the inhabited world" to that of particularism, though

it fired the imagination of the peoples in the three continents for centuries to come, was rather a feeble attempt at a World Order.

The driving force behind Alexander's conquests was personal ambition, pure and simple. A man who was jealous even of his father; who wept because there were no new worlds to conquer; who killed his best friend out of inflated egotism; who mercilessly drove soldiers to unknown regions and who was unable to halt and consolidate his conquests, could not bequeath a stable and durable order.

In Alexander's empire East and West met, but the achievement was attained at great cost. The fusion of races, and especially the fusion of Europeans and Orientals, was scarcely a success. It often resulted in the loss of the good qualities of both.

In country after country Hellenism introduced a new culture and a new approach to the problems of life, but at the same time it managed to undermine native culture and national institutions. Only the Jews, after a bloody struggle, and by an intense effort of self-discipline, barely succeeded in freeing themselves from the embraces of the stronger civilization. The ancient Egyptians, Phoenicians, and Syrians showed less resistance and thus vanished from the scene of history.

Watching Alexander's heritage—Oriental Hellenism—the Jew felt uneasy. The pagan search for sensual pleasure, the love of physical violence, infanticide, prostitution, the undignified and superficial imitation of a foreign culture, lack of purpose and direction, emptiness of life and the growth of racial hatred, could not fail to antagonize the Jew. He said: "Surely this chaos is not the salvation of humanity; surely the era of enlightenment and justice is not yet in sight." And the Jew went on his way in his search of a better world.

The centuries roll on and another ambitious man appears on the scene. He is Julius Caesar, the subjugator of the barbarians of the North and the colossus among the Romans. Like Alexander, Julius Caesar was a cosmopolitan, and in

the Jews, scattered in every corner of the Roman Empire and beyond the Euphrates, he saw an important ally.

That they were numerous and influential in Rome even before his succession to power can be gathered from Cicero's defence of Praetor Flaccus accused of extortion in Asia Minor, and of robbing the Temple in Jerusalem. "Thou well knowest", said the orator, addressing the prosecutor, "how great is their multitude, how great their concord, how powerful they are in our public assemblies. But I will speak in an undertone so that none but the judges may hear. For there is no lack of individuals ready to incite those fellows against me and all honourable persons. But I will not help them to do so."

Julius Caesar regarded the Jews as a link in his cosmopolitan empire and granted them privileges both in Rome and throughout the empire. In Palestine he became the patron of the Idumean dynasty and extended the Jewish frontiers, and in Egypt he confirmed the Jews in their privileges and gave them facilities for commerce. He protected the Jews against both Greek and Roman priests and showed great tolerance to Jewish exclusiveness so disliked and derided by Roman writers.

That the Jews were not ungrateful to the services rendered by Caesar can be gathered from the fact that after the assassination of Caesar the Jews of Rome surpassed all other foreign nationalities in wailing and lamenting the death of their benefactor.

Caesar gave humanity order and peace, and to the Jew order and peace meant survival and multiplication. Not only the river Orontes but also the Jordan flowed into the de-nationalized and largely Levantine capital, and in other centres of the empire the Jews constituted a factor only second in importance to that of the Romans and the Greeks.

But even the people of stolid soldiers and clever administrators and lawgivers and this mighty man, "the noblest man that ever lived in the tide of times", failed to satisfy the needs and aspirations of mankind.

Historians have written a great deal about the decline and decay of the Roman Empire. Those who dislike Christianity (Gibbon, for example) consider that it was one of the basic causes of the decline. Those who have faith in Christianity (John Buchan, for example) believe that Julius Caesar made a world possible for the "precious seed" of Christianity. Some emphasize bad finance, others bad morals. Some talk of the decay of the peasantry and the development of latifundia. Some talk of bad hygiene and others of a wrong policy of population.

From all these discussions and research the magnitude of the bankruptcy and decay of the Roman order clearly emerges. The failure is as immense as the achievement.

The Pax Romana, notwithstanding its great benefits to mankind, was primarily based on exploitation and greed. The conquered territories were heavily taxed, shamelessly robbed by Roman governors, deprived of valuable products and had their culture and institutions subverted, and in Rome a parasitic proletariat lived in a parasitic metropolis in a state of filth and degradation.

The empire as a whole lacked mass support. In spite of the evolution of Roman citizenship, the empire failed to arouse the loyalty and enthusiasm of the masses. Neither the idea of a representative government nor that of popular education was ever put into practice or even properly understood.

The empire lacked a moral basis and a moral impulse. "Nations, like men, need an aim, an ideal to keep them sound. The mere enjoyment of good administrative government is wholly inadequate to create or preserve real moral energy. . . . Caesar, in short, put an end to urban sedition and provincial misgovernment, but he and his great nephew gave the world instead of its old anarchy a period of mere soulless prosperity. If the barbarians had never resumed their attack from without, if Christianity had never arisen to give new ideas from within, the Roman Empire would have gradually sunk into a self-satisfied stationary civilization of the Chinese type" (Sir Charles Oman).

Wherever the Jew turned he saw exploitation, selfishness, senseless orgies, and the degeneration of the rulers and the masses. What he most resented was the fact that ultimately Roman sovereignty rested on one man, who claimed divine attributes. The clash between Jewish and Roman ideals resulted in a series of great Jewish revolts in Palestine and the Near East, and in the growth and spread of Christianity, which succeeded in the end in undermining the foundations of pagan Caesarism.

The centuries roll on. The Roman Empire is slowly but inevitably falling to pieces. In Arabia a meteor-like figure appears on the horizon. Within a few years Mohammed completes the conquest of Arabia and within a few years his inspired successors achieve great victories and successes beyond Arabia. The message of Islam is brought to many lands and nations.

Mohammed raged at the Jewish scholars and poets who scorned his advances and ridiculed his claim to be the messenger of God. Yet in spite of Mohammed's ruthless attacks on the "asses laden with books", and in spite of the oppressive legislation enacted by Omar, the Jews everywhere welcomed the Moslem conquerors and in some places assisted them. The condition of the Jews under Islam was improved, and in Spain the Jews attained great influence, while in the Ottoman Empire they were treated with humanity and justice. To the Jews the rise of Mohammed and Islam was a real blessing.

Islam possesses many attractive features. It is a brotherhood of men and peoples and is intensely democratic. It is simple and is not burdened with a highly organized priesthood or an elaborate system of ritual. Its founder is a powerful personality and a great genius and its appeal to many nations and peoples is undeniable.

Yet it is a religion of the Arabs, and the Arabs are the men of the desert, men who have little or no understanding of the complexities of civilization.

In Damascus, Baghdad, and Cordova the Arabs had

flourishing civilizations. Through Spain, Sicily, and Palestine they transmitted the heritage of the Greeks to Europe and taught it many useful lessons about the amenities of life, the art of war, trade, and geography. Yet more often than not, the Arabs brought the desert with them. East of the Jordan and in the Negev flourishing cities and villages existed in Roman times. They are no more. Iraq once possessed highly developed systems of irrigation. They vanished. The grass stopped growing; the water ceased flowing, and the sun shone more mercilessly than before "on miserable Fellahin, squatting among the ruins of a magnificent culture".

The Arabs put the blame on the Mongols, who systematically broke the irrigation system in Baghdad and, in general, attribute the state of neglect in the Middle East to Turkish misrule. Even so, they were unable to reconstruct what had been destroyed and for a long time they showed no signs of awakening. Sir William Muir emphasizes the paralysing effect which Islam had on nations and individuals. It may succeed, he says, in raising primitive races to a high level "but having raised them to a certain point, it leaves them there. Whether in things secular or spiritual there is no advance." In view of Arab emancipation and Arab awakening in the Middle East, these views seem now out of date and extreme, though even the friends of the Arabs admit there is a great deal of truth in them. Lawrence, for example, says of the Arabs: "they lack system, endurance, organization . . . they have been a government twenty times since the dawn of history, and as often after achievements they have grown tired, and let it fall."

The Arabs are a noble, brave, and likeable race, but they are not a people from whom world leadership can be recruited.

About a century and a half after the rise of Islam the Jews met in Europe a conqueror who played an important part in their settlement in that continent. Charlemagne (742-814), the founder of the Frankish Empire, encouraged

the settlement of the Jews in France and Germany. Before his time the Jews had found the conditions there unfavourable to their survival, and one hears very little about them. But already in the ninth century the Jews appear to be numerous and are spread over many parts of the empire. Many of the old-established Jewish communities in Germany have their origin in his reign or in those of his early successors.

It is even said that Charlemagne looked not only after the material needs of his Jewish subjects but also after their spiritual needs, and that he invited a Rabbi from Babylon to found a Talmudical college in Narbonne.

The role the Jews played in his reign was that of a commercial class within the empire, and of intermediaries between the lands of Europe and the lands of Islam. Their commercial experience, contacts, knowledge of languages and familiarity with both Islam and Christendom made them almost indispensable.

Charlemagne imposed certain disabilities on the Jews, but they were of little importance compared with the fact that he enabled the Jews to strike roots in Europe. Charlemagne brought the Jews into contact with the Germans and by his orderly and enlightened government ensured peace and prosperity to the Jewish communities in his empire.

But his was not an empire in the modern sense of the word. He had no regular army, no bureaucracy, no settled revenue payable in coin. He relied on his personal authority and the central institutions which he created did not survive his death. His Frankish Empire was mainly an attempt to bring Christianity and education to the pagans of Europe. It was only a weak portent of future world unity.

The centuries roll on and France, born after the disintegration of the Frankish Empire, was on the march, inspired by the genius of Napoleon Bonaparte.

Napoleon first approached the Jewish question from the point of view of a soldier. At the gates of Jerusalem in the year 1799, he issued an appeal to the Jews of Asia and

Africa to rise against the Turks in return for a promise to restore their glory in Jerusalem. In Europe, Napoleon was attracted to the Jewish question because he sought to obtain the assistance and sympathy of the numerous Jewish communities in Central and Eastern Europe. Guizot writes that during his campaigns Jews would help him by supplying him with food and information. He was heard to say in a joke that he had to thank the Jewish Sanhedrin for these good turns.

It was not only Napoleon the military leader but also Napoleon the law-maker who became interested in the Jewish problem.

The Jews attracted and repelled him in turns. He was attracted by their astonishing vitality and apparent immortality. From all the ruins of the empires the Jews had regularly and inevitably emerged intact and in good condition. He was attracted by the idea that their wealth and dispersion could be made use of in the fulfilment of his dream of empire and of a united Europe.

They repelled him by the fact that a great many of them, particularly in Alsace, were notorious for usury, avarice, and rapacity, and were highly unpopular with the native population.

The anomalous position of the Jew naturally irritated his logical mind. The Jews were not only a religious community but also a nation, and moreover, a nation within a nation. If the Jews were a separate nation how could they claim to be Frenchmen, and if they were Frenchmen they should abandon national exclusiveness and adapt themselves to their surroundings.

He believed that once the Jewish "constitution"—the root of the evil of Jewish exclusiveness—were modified by liberal reforms and adapted to French institutions, the Jews would find a place in his (Napoleon's) scheme of things.

By his orders an assembly of Jewish notabilities in lands under French influence met in 1806 and was followed by the Grand Sanhedrin in 1807. The result of the deliberations of the Sanhedrin was a Charter which defined the relations

between Jew and non-Jew in Napoleon's empire. It was held that Judaism was composed of two elements, the religious and the political. The political element could be modified to suit the revolutionary Napoleonic ideas. The religious ideas were declared to be unalterable, but even they were stretched to the utmost limit. Polygamy was declared illegal, divorce only allowed with the assent of the civil law, inter-marriage was to be tolerated, love and defence of country were to be the duty of every Jew, the entry of the Jews into the professions of the general population was encouraged and usury was forbidden.

Napoleon's attitude towards the Jews was full of contradictions. He wavered between a "Zionist" and an "Assimilationist" solution of the Jewish problem, and in fact attempted both. He admired Jewish qualities, but his admiration changed to dislike when in his campaigns in Eastern Europe he came across hundreds of medieval Jewish communities living in poverty and squalor. He took interest in the welfare of his Jewish soldiers and yet he had frequent anti-Jewish moods. His ambition was to improve the minds of the Jews and yet in 1808 he postponed Jewish rights of equality for ten years.

The attitude of the Jews towards him, too, was not constant. Sometimes they regarded him as a national deliverer and a beloved hero—the new Cyrus. Many songs of praise were composed to describe his glory and prowess and to express Jewish gratitude. But his ideas on the Jewish problem did not carry great weight with them.

The Sanhedrin was not an internal Jewish development. It was an instrument of Napoleon and entirely subordinated to his will. Napoleon had no real understanding of the Jewish masses, their needs and their dreams. The Jews regarded his plans for them with suspicion. Perhaps they also realized how ephemeral and flimsy his structure was. They had first-hand knowledge of empires and emperors, and they wondered how soon would he share the fate of the conquerors who had preceded him.

When Napoleon attacked Russia, Jewish opinion was divided but many of the Rabbis predicted his downfall, basing their predictions on suitable Biblical verses. A well-known Rabbi was asked whether he wanted the Czar or Napoleon to win. He answered that although Napoleon was bringing emancipation and prosperity to the Jews, he said, would prefer to see the Czar victorious. French victory, he said, would bring the Jews not only emancipation but also assimilation and that would "incur the displeasure of our Heavenly Father".

THE JEW MEETS THE ANGLO-SAXONS

THE great conquerors all showed interest in the Jews. Sometimes they co-operated with them and sometimes they persecuted them, but they never ignored them. They all tried to find the answer to the Jewish riddle and it always evaded them.

Salvation never came from the conquerors. Napoleon arrived on the scene and then vanished, and so will Hitler. They are the accidents in the story of mankind—the blind instruments of the moment. Their power is ephemeral and their policies rest on unsound foundations and insufficient insight.

A far more solid and lasting factor in the modern world is the rise of the Anglo-Saxons. It is to them that the Jews turn for help and sympathy and it is to them that the Jews entrust their destiny.

The Anglo-Saxons have already done a great deal for the Jews. First they granted to the Jews living in their lands absolute equality and rights of citizenship. Second, they helped to lay the foundations for the Jewish homeland in Palestine. They thus stood guard on the cradle of Jewish Nationalism.

The Anglo-Saxons had an insight into the aspirations of the Jewish masses. They consulted their leaders and took the wishes of the people into consideration. They generally refrained from imposing their own solutions from above.

They understood Zionism not only because the Anglo-Saxons tend to encourage self-development and self-expression of all nations, but also because Zionism is itself an Anglo-Saxon movement, having deep roots in Anglo-Saxon institutions and Anglo-Saxon idealism.

There is a whole literature on the subject, and I do not propose to elaborate on it. It would be sufficient to mention three typical incidents. (1) In 1621 Sir Henry Finch,

serjeant-at-law, wrote a book entitled *The World's Great Restauration, or Calling of the Jews*, inviting the Children of Israel to realize the prophecies by asserting their national existence and called upon the Christian Princes to do homage to the Jewish nation. James I was enraged by this "Zionist" outburst, treated the work as a libel, and had the author arrested. Sir Henry Fineh was only released after apologizing to the sovereign for having written inadvisedly. (2) In 1657 a Cambridge English scholar collected £300 for the poor Jews of Jerusalem. (3) A Messianic movement developed among the English just as it did among the Jews. There were quite a number of English pseudo-Messiahs. One of the best known is Richard Brothers (1757-1824) described as "God Almighty's Nephew". He declared that he was the "Revealed Prince of Hebrews" and predicted the Restoration of the Hebrews to Jerusalem in 1798 under his own leadership. He went so far as to draw up a constitution of the new Jerusalem.

But Anglo-Saxon Zionism is not confined merely to obscure or eccentric personalities. It has been seriously taken up by some of the most famous and powerful of Anglo-Saxon statesmen. It would therefore be of interest to select some of the significant encounters between the Anglo-Saxon leaders and the Jew.

(t) Oliver Cromwell

In the year 1655 Menasseh ben Israel—a Jewish religious mystic—set out from Amsterdam to present a petition to Oliver Cromwell for the readmission of the Jews to England.

Not long after presenting his Humble Addresses on behalf of the Jewish Nation he had an audience with the Lord Protector, and was also entertained by him. The subject of their talks, according to Lucien Wolf, was Spanish refugees, Poland, and Palestine. Cromwell was brought up on the Bible. He was well versed in the story of the Jews as related in the Old Testament. He was anxious to hear the sequel to that story.

Cromwell was particularly interested in the Jewish refugees from Spain and Portugal. The expulsion of the Jews from the Iberian peninsula, which had taken place more than a century and a half earlier, was still the dominant fact in the Jewish situation at that time. Its repercussions were still felt over the civilized world and particularly in the New World where England was pursuing a policy of colonial and commercial expansion. They also discussed the reports of Jewish suffering in Poland. Bloody massacres of Jews were taking place in Poland, at first as a result of the Cossack rebellion and later, at that very moment in fact, as a result of the Russian and Swedish invasions. A third topic of discussion was the condition of the Jewish community in Palestine (Refugees, Poland, and Palestine are, characteristically enough, still the main subject of discussion between Jewish and Anglo-Saxon leaders.)

Cromwell took a liking to the Portuguese Jew. There was something magnetic about the Jew's personality and both, though one was the most powerful man in England and the other was a poor Jewish author, had much in common. Later Cromwell showed his personal friendship by granting Menasseh a pension of £100 per annum.

Menasseh based his plea for the readmission of the Jews on three grounds. (1) Millenary motives, i.e. universal dispersion was a necessary circumstance before the Redemption of Israel could take place, and that by the words like "end of the earth" in Deuteronomy might be understood this island. (2) That it was best in the interests of the Jewish people to live in friendship with the English. "Therefore", he says, "I applied myself, in all zealous affection to the English nation, congratulating their glorious liberty which at this day they enjoy together with their prosperous peace." (3) That it would be in the interests of England. Menasseh laid stress on the Jewish qualities of "Utility" and "Fidelity".

Cromwell was impressed. He favoured the readmission of the Jews on two grounds. He sought guidance in the Bible and was strongly influenced by Messianic prophecies.

But above all he was a statesman, a practical man, and a realist. He had no patience with some of his more extreme followers who talked exclusively in the terms of the Old Testament and who lost their balance by excessive mysticism. He sought, therefore, to base his policy on national considerations. He realized that the Jews would be important allies in the furtherance of the expansion and welfare of the Commonwealth. They had wealth, experience, knowledge, and world-wide connections. They played an important part in the commercial rise of Leghorn, Amsterdam, and Hamburg. They would become his "intelligencers" and help to realize his ambitions particularly in the West Indies.

Who took the initiative in starting the movement in England? Was it the Jews or the English? It is difficult to answer the question definitely. The anti-Semites and foreign agents hinted at Jewish bribes and spread crude libels that the Jews were contemplating the purchase of St. Paul's Cathedral and the Bodleian Library at Oxford, and that Puritans and Jews were busy arguing and bargaining over the price to be paid. Lucien Wolf, the Jewish historian, takes the view that Cromwell himself was behind the whole matter and that he even caused Menasseh to be brought to England. "There is ample evidence", he says, "that he (Cromwell) was the mainspring of the whole movement, and that Menasseh was but a puppet in his hands." There is support for this view in Menasseh's own writings. In Amsterdam Menasseh was already informed of the attitude of influential Englishmen. "The communications and correspondence", writes Menasseh, "I have held for some years since, with some eminent persons of England, was the first originell of my undertaking this design. For I always found by them a great probability of attaining what I now request, whilst they affirmed that at this time the minds of men stood very well affected towards us and that our entrance into this Island would be very acceptable and well pleasing with them." In his message to his people on the day of his departure for England,

he says: "I have been informed by letters, and by faithful correspondents, that today this English nation is no longer our ancient enemy, but has changed the papistical religion and become excellently affected to our nation, as an oppressed people whereof it has good hope." It is clear, therefore, that Menasseh received great encouragement before and after undertaking his mission. It can safely be said that the Puritans, if they did not initiate the whole movement, did at least meet the Jews half-way.

It must be confessed, however, that the account of the debates and controversies which followed Cromwell's motion that the "Jewes deserving it may be admitted into this nation to trade and trafficke and dwell amongst us as providence shall give occasion" is rather disappointing. It is obvious that Cromwell was far in advance of his time. A great deal of opposition came from commercial people, particularly the merchants of London, who feared Jewish competition. The Whitehall Conference, a notable gathering of clergymen, scholars and leaders, was divided in its views and could not offer any guidance to Cromwell. Cromwell, who presided at some of its meetings, was displeased with the trend of discussion. In a fiery and rousing speech to the Conference, it was one of the best he had ever made, he expressed his disappointment and complained of "a babel of discordances". He sarcastically rebuked the London merchants who were apprehensive of Jewish rivalry and intimated that he would make his own decision. He then vacated the chair.

The result was that no official declaration was made on the readmission of the Jews to England. Cromwell's attitude, however, was well known and the policy of "connivance" at the Jewish settlement in England became recognized. The re-establishment of Anglo-Jewry became a fact.

It was all for the best. Had legislation been passed it would have probably been reversed at the time of the Restoration, and the Jews would have faced another expulsion. How "inscrutable are the workings of Providence and of the English temperament"!

Lord Palmerston

In April 1840 Sir Moses Montefiore had an audience with Lord Palmerston at Downing Street.

Sir Moses Montefiore was the great Jewish leader and philanthropist of the nineteenth century. He visited Palestine seven times and pleaded on behalf of the Jews before Mehemet Ali, the Turkish Sultan, and the Czar. He was honoured by Queen Victoria and was the idol of the Jewish masses throughout the world.

Sir Moses was keenly interested in the well-being of the Jews in Palestine and was a supporter of the "Fund for the Cultivation of Land in Palestine by the Jews". During that meeting Sir Moses spoke to Lord Palmerston about the prospects for Jewish agriculture in Palestine and also about the protection of the Jews in the East. Palmerston informed him that he had his authority to tell the Jews in the East that the influence of the British Government would be used on their behalf and that any serious complaint should be made to the English consuls, who would present them to the Authorities.

As far as Jewish settlement in Palestine is concerned, we know from various sources that the matter occupied the mind of Lord Palmerston both before and after this talk.

The Earl of Shaftesbury, one of the most prominent of the Gentile Zionists, says in his Diary: "August 1st, 1838. Dined with Palmerston. After dinner left alone with him. Propounded my scheme, which seemed to strike his fancy: he asked more questions, and readily promised to consider it. How singular is the order of Providence. Singular, that is, if estimated by man's ways. Palmerston had already been chosen by God to be an instrument of good to His ancient people, to do homage, as it were, to their inheritance, and to recognize their rights without believing their destiny. And it seems he will yet do more. But though the motive be kind, it is not sound. I am forced to argue politically, financially, commercially. These considerations strike home:

he weeps not, like his Master, over Jerusalem, nor prays that now, at last, she may put on her beautiful garments."

The conversations of the Earl of Shaftesbury and of Sir Moses Montesiore had a great effect on Lord Palmerston. In fact, the English Foreign Secretary went as far as to propose to the Turks that the Jews scattered through other countries in Europe and Africa, should be induced to go and settle in Palestine because the wealth and habits of order and industry which they would bring with them would tend greatly to increase the resources of the Turkish Empire and promote the progress of civilization there.

The Zionist schemes of Britain for the Jews in Palestine were bold ones, but they were approved by Queen Victoria. Had they been accepted both the prestige of Britain and her interests would have greatly benefited.

"Turkish obstinacy", says Harold Temperley, in *England and the Near East*, "prevailed and the whole project fell to the ground. It looks, too, as if Palmerston wished ultimately to protect the Jews throughout Turkey. That was a strong step to take and would have given England that special right to protection of Jews throughout Turkey, such as the Czar was to claim for Turkish subjects of the Orthodox Greek faith. The Czar's claim was ultimately contested by Palmerston and the attempt to enforce it led to war between Russia on the one side and Turkey, France, and England on the other. Palmerston's own attempt, even if confined to Syria and Palestine, must have provoked great jealousy from France and from Russia. If extended to the whole Ottoman Empire it might have led to war."

Lord Balfour

There were two sides to the character of Lord Balfour. On the one hand he was a brilliant intellectual, renowned for his wit, air of detachment, scepticism, and clever repartee. On the other hand, he had a streak of mysticism, due to his Scottish upbringing and the influence of the Bible.

Both qualities drew him towards the Jews. As an intel-

lectual he was interested in their contributions to philosophy, and as a mystic he was eager to follow the fortunes of the people of the Bible.

During the General Elections of 1906 Lord Balfour learned from his chairman in Manchester, who happened to be a Jew, that a young Russian Zionist—Dr. C. Weizmann—was then living in Manchester, as lecturer of Organic Chemistry, in the University. Balfour expressed the desire to meet him. He wanted first-hand information about the Zionist movement, information which he was unable to secure from the assimilated Jews.

The encounter between the two men is already one of the best-known events in the annals of Zionism. It is to be found in almost every school text-book of Jewish History.

Balfour was especially interested in the Zionist view on territorialism. He asked Weizmann why the Jews had rejected Chamberlain's offer of colonization in Uganda in East Africa. "I began", says Weizmann, "to sweat blood to make my meaning clear through my English. At the very end I made an effort, I had an idea. I said. 'Mr. Balfour, if you were offered Paris instead of London, would you take it? Would you take Paris instead of London?' He looked surprised. 'But London is our own' I said: 'Jerusalem was our own when London was a marsh.' He said: 'That's true.' I did not see him again till 1916."

Mrs. Blanche Dugdale—who carries on the Balfour tradition of Zionism in England—makes the following comment on the meeting: "Both participants described it to me many times afterwards in a way that showed the unusual sympathy which sprang up, almost at first sight, between two leaders, widely separated by every material circumstance of life and tradition."

During the last war, in the capacity of Foreign Secretary, Balfour threw his weight for the recognition of Jewish claims to Palestine. He wrestled with all his might with the opponents of Zionism, both inside and outside the Cabinet, both with the assimilated Jews and the sceptic Englishmen.

He won. The famous Balfour Declaration was issued. The Zionists who were anxiously awaiting the result of the Cabinet deliberations were told, "It is a boy."

The association between Balfour and the Jews never ceased. There was something indefinably fine and sacred in the attachment of Balfour to the Jewish cause. In the House of Lords he battled with the diehards who could not understand why the British Government had been committed to such a hazardous adventure. In public meetings he exhorted the British nation not to abandon the glorious enterprise. He counselled the Jews to persevere and have faith, and he appealed to the Arabs not to grudge the Jews the small notch of ground. In 1925 he visited Palestine for the opening ceremony of the Hebrew University. The Jews gave him a welcome of which even Royalty could be proud. Indeed, some of the Arabs were saying that the "King of the Jews" was on a visit to the country. Today his name is perpetuated in the Jewish settlements in Palestine and in the hearts of the Jewish nation throughout the world. A Briton, who happens to have the same name, relates how in Baghdad a Jewish shoemaker refused to accept payment on learning that his name was Balfour. This incident is characteristic of the deep affection between the Jews and the man who understood them.

The attachment lasted till the end. One of the most moving passages in Mrs Dugdale's Life Story of her uncle is the last meeting between Weizmann and Balfour before the latter's death, March 1930. "A few days before the end he received for a few moments a visitor from outside the circle of his family. This was Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the Zionist leader.

"No one but myself saw the brief and silent farewell between these two, so diverse from one another, whose mutual sympathy had been so powerful an instrument in the history of a nation. The privacy of their last meeting would not be broken here except for one reason. A few days later, millions of poor Jews in the ghettos of Eastern Europe

and the slums of New York were bewailing with deep personal grief the loss of a British statesman whose face they had never seen. All over the world the ceremonial candles were lit in the synagogues, and the Prayer of Remembrance, the A'skara, was chanted Never in living memory has this been done for any Gentile. For the sake of the people who repaid his understanding of them with the greatest tribute in their power to bestow, it is right to record the visit of Chaim Weizmann to Balfour's death-bed. It was not the love or sorrow of an individual alone which was expressed by the tears of the Jew that day. No words passed between them, or could pass, for Balfour was very weak, and Dr. Weizmann much overcome."

Winston Churchill

Winston Churchill has been one of the most powerful champions of the Zionist movement. It has been the happy fate of that movement and of Palestine to be associated with the statesman who will go down in history as the man who was first to organize world resistance against the pestilence of Hitlerism and first to succeed in stopping the rot of that foul disease.

Already in 1903, at the time of the Kishineff massacres, Churchill raised his voice of protest. For a time he showed interest in Zangwill's territorialist schemes, but after the issue of the Balfour Declaration he became a warm supporter of the idea of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine.

In 1921, as Colonial Secretary, he paid a visit to Palestine. He saw the difficulties which the Zionists were facing in Palestine, but he admired the work which was being done and the type of Jew that lived there. Later in the House of Commons he had an opportunity of describing a visit to a Jewish colony. He gave an account of the flourishing condition of the colony and his favourable impression of the healthy and happy Jewish agriculturists who had welcomed and honoured him.

In Jerusalem he met Arab and Jewish delegations. He

was very firm with the Arabs and advised them to co-operate with the Jews. To the Jewish delegation he counselled prudence and patience.

He stayed at Government House and from there he beheld the Jordan Valley and the Hills of Moab. There are few men who are not affected by the beauty of the scene and by its great historic associations. Churchill, being both an artist and an historian, was deeply moved. He painted half a dozen canvasses. It was "a remarkable outburst of virtuosity."

During his stay he met a great Jewish personality—Pinhas Rutenberg. Rutenberg had a very unusual career. He was born in Russia and early in life he joined the Social Revolutionary Movement. He was entrusted by the Party with the execution of Father Gapon—an agent provocateur, who had played a sinister role in the notorious butchery of Russian peasants during a demonstration. Later he left Russia and practised as an engineer in Italy. He was also active in Zionist affairs and stayed for a time in the United States. In 1917 he was back in Russia and joined the Kerensky Government, holding a high office in North Russia. He was opposed to the Bolshevik Revolution and left for Palestine to work out plans for the electrification of the country—an old favourite idea of his.

Both Churchill and Rutenberg have had remarkable careers. One has been a soldier, journalist, author, politician, and the other was a revolutionary engineer, politician. One was destined to become a world statesman and the other the leader of the Palestinian Jews. Both loved life and applied themselves with zest to the capture of its prizes.

Rutenberg talked about the electrification of Palestine, and Churchill was convinced of the soundness of his plans. In England Churchill was later to come out with a brilliant defence of Rutenberg's character and work. He refuted the suggestion that Rutenberg was a dangerous Bolshevik with a black record. He pointed out that it was unfair to apply the standards of the peaceful and orderly English life to

dark and turbulent Russia. He insisted that only Rutenberg and his friends were in a position to undertake the concession for the generation of electric light for Palestine.

And just as in Rutenberg Churchill found an anti-Bolshevik comrade so in Zionism he saw the answer to the appeal which Bolshevism was exercising on certain sections of the Jewish people. He believed that the struggle between Bolshevism and Zionism was in fact a struggle for the soul of the Jewish people. Churchill of today is no longer the anti-Bolshevist he was in the early twenties. And the gap between Zionism and Bolshevism has also narrowed. One of the most probable result of this change will be the recognition of Zionism both by the Soviet authorities and the British Government.

In 1930 the British Government decided to curtail Zionist work, or rather, to bring it to a standstill. Churchill, who was in America at the time, said that the Balfour Declaration consisted of two promises of equal validity, one to the Jews and one to the Arabs. But there was this difference between the two promises, the promise to the Jews was of a positive character, that to the Arabs was of a negative character. He considered that the Government were wrongly interpreting the significance of each stipulation.

In 1935 Churchill visited Palestine once more. He realized that the progress made was enormous. He compared the advance in Palestine with the state of stagnation in the neighbouring country of Syria. He was satisfied that Zionism was doing well. He was opposed, therefore, to the attempt of the British Government to introduce a Legislative Council in Palestine which would act as a brake on the Jewish experiment. In 1936 he spoke to the House of Commons to that effect.

In 1939 Churchill made a powerful attack in the House on the policy of appeasement and the attitude of the Government to the Jew with regard to Palestine. He solemnly declared: "As one intimately and responsibly concerned in the earlier stages of our Palestine policy, I could not stand by

and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the world set aside for reasons of administrative convenience—and it will be a vain hope—for the sake of a quiet life. . . . I should feel personally embarrassed in the most acute manner if I lent myself by silence or inaction to what I must regard as an act of repudiation "

The influence of great statesmen penetrates every department of national life. The influence of Churchill has even deeply penetrated Jewish affairs. The Jews have carefully studied every article, letter, gesture and speech (if collected they will make up a thick volume) he has made on their behalf during his long political career. They hope, pray, and believe that in the hour of decision he will not fail them.

Field-Marshal Smuts

Although a Boer by race Field-Marshal Smuts is a typical representative of the Anglo-Saxons. He was one of the main architects of the League of Nations and the Mandates system (both largely an Anglo-Saxon inspiration) after the last war. He was then, as he is now, a fervent believer in the Jewish return to Palestine. In fact, he regards the Jewish enterprise in Palestine as one of the few positive and useful things emerging from the first World War, and his own contribution to it as the most significant thing he has ever done in his life.

In South Africa the Jews are relatively numerous, constituting about 5 per cent of the white population. But they are a fine breed. They are taller than their East European parents, they are healthy in body and generous in soul. They are proud of their national and religious traditions and are keen supporters of the Jewish homeland in Palestine.

Field-Marshal Smuts met these South African Jews and liked them. He found them a stimulating, interesting, and friendly people. He saw that there was a great deal in common between Boers and the Jews. Both are, as he puts it, "small, resistant, bitter peoples", who are not easy to

manage and whose manners are none too perfect. To both peoples the Old Testament is a living thing, to the Boers, perhaps, more than to the Jews, for the Jews have become too commercial and too spoiled by their wanderings, while the Boers are still the typical Old Testament patriarchs.

Smuts himself is a typical Boer. But he is more than that. He rises above local South African politics. He has a world horizon. He is not only a leader of his own people but one of the spokesmen of the English-speaking world as well. And as a world leader he likes the company of a people that knows the ropes of the world and that can think in terms of world politics.

Above all, he understands the spiritual force which is Jewry. "The older I get", he says, "the more of an Hebraist I become. They knew God, those old Jews. There is no literature like the great psalms. Then comes Isaiah. I put the Bible above Shakespeare who has to me the deficiency of being without religion."

To Smuts, the Balfour Declaration of 1917 was in the final analysis an act of religious significance. He describes the emotions which made its consummation possible. "The French army, after the Nivelle disaster, appeared struck with defeatism, if not despair, and had for months been reduced to a state of passivity. The British army, in a vain effort to save the situation, had floundered through Flanders mud with losses which appalled the stoutest. Russia had gone out of the war. The Americans, although in the war, were not yet ready to bear their part in it. It was, indeed, one of the darkest hours of that war. And then, at this moment the ancient promise to Israel, made thousands of years ago, was once more renewed. . . . Was it a vow made in our sore trial? Was it a vision of the future, such as sometimes appears at the darkest hours? Was it an act of faith, such as made Abraham willing even to sacrifice his only son in his extreme old age?"

President Roosevelt

The expulsion of the Jews from Spain and the first voyage of Columbus to America both took place in the year 1492. It was a symbolic coincidence. A new world was discovered to redress the balance of the old world. The triumph of darkness and cruelty was nullified by the sowing of seeds of toleration and humanity in a continent across the ocean.

In America both the traditions of tolerance and of Zionism are part of the American national heritage. Roger Williams (1604-1684), the founder of the colony of Rhode Island, was the great champion of religious liberty and toleration. For him, America, like his own settlement, was a "shelter for persons distressed for conscience".

He conceived it to be his duty to break down that "superstitious wall of separation (as to civil things) between us Gentiles and the Jews, and freely (without this asking) to make way for their fall and peaceable Habitation amongst us", because, "the unchristian oppressions, incivilities and inhumanities of this Nation against the Jews have cried to Heaven against this Nation and the Kings and Princes of it."

John Adams (1735-1826), the second President of the United States, wrote a letter to Major Mordecai Manuel in which he said "I really wish the Jews again in Judea, an independent nation, for, as I believe, the most enlightened men of it have participated in the amelioration of the philosophy of the age, once restored to an independent government, and no longer persecuted, they would soon wear away some of the asperities and peculiarities of their character." At the same time he stressed that the Jews should not be deprived of their civil rights in other countries. "I wish your nation may be admitted to all privileges of citizens in every part of the world. This country (America) has done much; I wish it may do more, and annul every narrow idea in religion, government, and commerce."

About fifty years ago, William Blackstone, a Protestant clergyman, wrote a memorandum to Harrison, the President

of the United States, to which influential American leaders subscribed, urging him to summon a conference of Powers to discuss the Jewish question and Palestine.

President Taft, the Republican, abrogated the commercial treaty between America and Russia on account of the Czarist anti-Jewish excesses, and later in his career made a memorable speech in which he praised the Jewish spirit and the Jewish contribution to American life and civilization.

President Wilson, the Democrat, approved the Balfour Declaration and the idea of a Jewish Commonwealth. He considered that the principle of self-determination should be extended to include the Jewish people. When the problem of the frontiers of Palestine was discussed the President, then on his sick-bed, sent a message that the honour of Christendom was involved in providing the Jewish homeless with adequate frontiers. As a result of the message, described by Lloyd George as a "bomb-shell", the coastline of Palestine was moved north to the border of Tyre and inland to Merom.

Zionism in America is not entirely a Jewish growth. The Puritan element which laid the foundations of the United States has evolved a "Gentile Zionism" which is similar to the movement in England. And it has succeeded in influencing other forces of American life in that direction. These men are not merely "pro-Zionist"; they are Zionists and possess a long Zionist tradition.

President Roosevelt, being the embodiment of what is best in American life, carries on the Zionist tradition. His views on the matter are well known: they will be of decisive importance when the Day of Judgment comes. He has always maintained that the world cannot wash its hands of the Jewish problem, that it is unjust and cruel to let masses of uprooted humanity wander in unseaworthy ships on the high seas, freeze to death on the Danube and the forests of Poland, and perish in the ghettos and concentration camps. Already in 1938 he took the initiative to call a conference of nations to discuss the refugee problem. It was not a success, for the nations had no time for long-term policies. They

lived from hand to mouth. They were then busy appeasing the aggressors. The Evian Conference, however, is a symbol of things to come. The problem of Jewish homelessness will not be evaded when the great gathering of the nations takes place.

That Roosevelt recognizes the moral impulse of Zionism is due to many factors. But perhaps one of the strongest influences was his intimate friendship with Brandeis.

Brandeis is to America what Herzl is to Europe. His stature is big, but to describe him as the "greatest American Jew" is an understatement. Already before the First World War Brandeis, himself a great liberal, was convinced that emancipation and liberalism could not really solve the Jewish problem. The Jews, he believed, had their stone to contribute to the pyramid of history and the structure of the world would be incomplete and faulty if the Jews were deprived of a homeland.

Both President Wilson and President Roosevelt listened to him. He was not only one of the great legal minds in America, but a lovely, charming, and fine personality. President Roosevelt would often say that listening to Brandeis was like listening to the Prophet Isaiah. A man of such integrity, dignity, and humanity was inherently incapable of advocating an idea which was wrong or unjust. The intimate friendship between the two men has had—and will have—incalculable consequences to the destiny of Israel.

The Jews know it, though sometimes they are rather impatient. Whenever things go wrong with them, and they often do, whenever they are overwhelmed by threats, tyranny, persecutions, and humiliations, they turn to Roosevelt, and he listens patiently and does everything he can or considers advisable. The Jewish Press does not keep secret its belief that Roosevelt—the world leader—will alter the course of the Jewish history by solving the problem of Jewish homelessness.

They look up to him like a father. Their gratitude knows no bounds. In October 1910, during the Presidential Elec-

tions, a demonstration in his honour took place in New York which gives an idea of what the Jews feel about him. The whole Jewish population on the East Side celebrated his visit. There were amazing scenes of enthusiasm. Jewish tailors and shop-keepers cheered wildly. Zionist flags were hoisted beside American flags. It was a real festival. For years to come Jewish parents in New York will tell their children about a good President of a great nation who stood up for them, who knew their sufferings and tried to mitigate them, and who was familiar with their national aspirations and stood by when threats to thwart them came.

The Jew meets the Anglo-Saxons This meeting has been the best thing that has happened to the Jews in their long and sad history.

The Jews have, therefore, in all humility and gratitude, to see that there is no discord between their ideals and those of their bigger brother. They should not do anything which is contrary to the thought and standards of the English-speaking communities. While maintaining their national identity and national life they must fit in their national policy to the framework of the world policy of the Anglo-Saxons. This should be an axiom of Jewish policy.

Zionism does not mean exclusiveness nor the ghetto spirit. There is no need for the Jews to build walls and shut themselves in. The Jews, like the Anglo-Saxons, must reaffirm their faith in a world community and world co-operation.

Fortunately, the leaders of the Jews in the English-speaking world understand this. Professor S. Brodetsky, the leader of the Jews in Britain, rejects the ghetto mentality and advocates a policy of co-operation with the progressive forces in the world. In the United States Stephen Wise is considered both a good American and a good Zionist, and so are Edmund Kaufman and Judge Levinthal, the representatives of the new school of Zionists, who are succeeding in finding a synthesis between Americanism and Zionism.

It must be admitted, on the other hand, that not all Englishmen or Americans have the same horizons and vision

as their leaders. Some of them are still unable to appreciate the significance of the Jewish experiment in Palestine and believe there is something underhand about it. The Jews have, therefore, the task of explaining the moral basis of Zionism. They have to send missionaries to the Christians just as the Christians have sent missionaries to the Jews.

Many of them will then understand that the Palestine problem cannot be resolved in terms of a local issue between Arabs and Jews, or depend on whether the Jews or Arabs have better manners. The Englishmen and Americans will understand. No race has such a highly developed political instinct for the right thing. They will sense the importance of Zionism and will back a venture which is noble and worth while. They will use legal, economic, political, and sociological arguments in support, but deep in their hearts they will know that they are guided by the hand of destiny. They will not ignore the beckoning of the hand. For "he who touches Palestine touches eternity".

GERMANS OR ANGLO-SAXONS?

THE failure of the great conquerors to establish and maintain a world community was due to many factors. But even if the great conquerors had possessed all the qualities of statesmanship, and even if they had been inspired by idealism, love of humanity, and religious faith and vision, they would still have been thwarted by the facts of geography and the backwardness of science. At best they could have achieved a limited success followed by exhaustion and collapse.

Space had to be conquered. The resources of the world had to be harnessed to the will of man before humanity could hope to build up a world system.

Since the fall of Napoleon science has changed the face of the earth more thoroughly than the previous thousand years taken together. The nineteenth century saw an unparalleled increase in agricultural production, an even greater increase in industrial production and international trade, a dramatic reduction of distances by the introduction of steamboats and railways and the growing facilities for human intercourse by the development of telegraph, telephone, and wireless. It cannot be too often emphasized that the world has become a closely knit and complex nervous and vascular system. If nervous breakdown and continuous bleeding are to be avoided the world must become more integrated and put under a more unified control. The choice is between world chaos and world order.

After two world wars, the greatest in history, after unparalleled social unrest and revolution, mankind is beginning to be conscious of the choice, and to understand the strength of the forces which are pressing towards a new era and to sense the coming of a great climax in the story of man.

Who will be the leading architects in this new structure? Whose ideals will predominate in the laying of the foundations of the new era? Leadership is essential in all human

activities and is more so among nations. The question is not whether it is necessary or not but whether it is good or bad leadership. Whether it is in the interests of all nations or of the leading nation only. We saw the defects of Greek, Roman, Arab, and French leadership. Can we have leadership which is free of these defects or which has them to a small extent only? Let us imagine that the traditional visitor from Mars comes to our planet to make the choice. He would not be interested so much in the immediate causes of this war, nor in the rights and wrongs of the Germans, the English, the French, the Polish, etc., as in selecting the best people for the job.

He would first turn to the Germans, who have already staked their claim to be the "Herrenvolk", and who have subordinated their whole national life to the fulfilment of this ambition. At first sight he would be quite unimpressed. He would find a race 80,000,000 strong dwelling in the heart of Europe, possessing a mighty industrial organization and scientific aptitude. He would find the Germans thorough, painstaking, methodical, disciplined, and animated by a mad passion for power and organization. They have evolved a system of government which, though not so novel and revolutionary as they claim it to be, can undoubtedly display resolute leadership, singleness of purpose, rapidity of decision, unity (apparent or real) and strength.

On closer examination and meditation our observer would begin to have certain misgivings. The very fact that a nation claims to be superior to every other nation is a serious defect of character. Leadership is not domination. A real leader is often recognized without having to blow his own trumpet; he does not attempt to impose his leadership by blood and iron if those who are to be led do not recognize the advantages of his leadership.

Strength by itself is not a sufficient guarantee of good leadership. It is extremely objectionable if used in the wrong way. The Germans have strength but they also possess a streak of cruelty in their character which has become more

pronounced in the last ten years. To leave humanity at their mercy is like putting a murderer in charge of a children's home.

Germany is an industrial and military giant. Yet it is a giant which lacks insight into the needs, motives, and aspirations of other peoples. It is a stupid giant.

This sort of stupidity can be best exemplified by the behaviour of the Foreign Minister, von Ribbentrop—"the best Foreign Minister since Bismarck". During his stay in London in the capacity of Ambassador at St. James's, he completely misunderstood the English mentality and misjudged the springs of British policy. This psychological defect can also be illustrated from the pre-Nazi era. In Palestine the Arabs tell a story of the Kaiser's visit to Jerusalem at the end of the last century. It is a small and unimportant incident, but it illustrates the obtuseness of the German make-up. It is typical, although it may not be historical. The Kaiser, the story runs, visited the house of a local Arab notability. The latter showed him round his house, pointing out some valuable furniture and ornaments and in the customary Oriental fashion, which is never meant to be taken seriously, said: "It is all yours." The Kaiser took him at his word and later sent some of his men to fetch the stuff, leaving the house almost bare. . . .

The Germans have a gift for detailed and grandiose planning. They can build immense structures which rest, however, on slimy foundations. They can work out comprehensive systems of philosophy and they can build a great State on assumptions like the following: That the Aryans are the only creative people in history; that might is right; that truth, science, and religion are handmaids to ruling party and the State; that Germany is a law unto herself; that "conscience is a Jewish invention", and so on. But what is the use of constructing gigantic structures on wrong principles? Such structures should be pulled down immediately, for they are a danger to the inmates as well as to outsiders. Wrong assumptions—this is what vitiates even the great achievements of Germany.

The attainments and victories of the Nazis suffer also from haste. Enduring things in history take a long time to mature. The story of human evolution is one of great toil, of endless gropings and groanings. It is the story of the coral island and of the accumulated results of slow changes. Catastrophism does occur in life but its effects are invariably destructive and not constructive. Catastrophes have never built, because to build one must have patience. There is no short cut in life. If the Nazis had been mature men they would have gone slowly about their task perhaps for generations. They would have been alarmed at their rapid successes. But the Nazis are not mature and have no understanding of the forces of history and mankind. They rush in like fools and arouse against them the dormant forces of humanity and mobilize against them the anger of the rest of mankind.

But probably the Nazis cannot afford to wait. Hitler distinctly said so to the British Ambassador before the outbreak of war. Like Napoleon, he realizes that his house of cards is up against time, and like Napoleon he is sufficiently deluded to think that he can beat time. The Nazi bid for conquest is a gambler's attempt to steal world leadership and to usurp functions which do not belong to him by the orderly process of evolution.

Co-operation is the essence of a happy and progressive society of nations. The Nazis, however, do not understand the meaning of the word co-operation. In the early part of the war after the signing of the Soviet-German pact in 1939, intelligent men were apprehensive of one development, i.e. that Hitler and Stalin might succeed in coming to a real and sincere understanding and fight together a war on anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist slogans. These apprehensions proved to be without foundation. Hitler, like Napoleon, can trust no other nation and is in turn not trusted by other nations. He is inherently incapable of the spirit of give and take and compromise. Of him it has been said that you either devour him or are devoured by him; there can be no other relationship.

When the passions of our times have died down; when the history of this age comes to be written more or less objectively, it will perhaps be said that Hitler fulfilled an important role in the transition between the old and the new eras. He will probably be acclaimed as the greatest destroyer in history, as the man who smashed old-fashioned, sluggish, and inefficient systems but was unable to put anything in their place. He will be regarded as the man who accelerated the process of collectivism and prepared the ground for world solidarity and cohesion. Hitler is a terrible portent—the nightmare before the dawn—the Devil announcing the coming of the Messianic age.

Of the laborious and difficult tasks of world reconstruction Hitler shows no real understanding. This can best be illustrated by his handling of the Jews. Hitler the philosopher and historian shows unbelievable ignorance of the Jewish question. His references to the Jews in *Mein Kampf* are a confused collection of extracts from cheap anti-Semitic pamphlets and a caricature of the Jews in the worst possible taste. You could squeeze him time and time again and not find a drop of charity or sympathy for the great Jewish tragedy.

Nevertheless, Hitler the man of action could have become, in spite of his intellectual limitations, a great statesman. He had the power to give a constructive solution to the Jewish problem by co-operating with Jewish authorities in an orderly transfer of the Jews and their property and by urging the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine. Such mass migration would have involved some suffering to many individual Jews, but there would have been a certain amount of historical justice in it. Instead, he puts them into concentration camps, chases them out of the country, robs them of their property, and incites the Arab population in Palestine to massacre those wretched refugees who manage to escape from his terror. Hitler does not want to solve the Jewish question, he wants to destroy the Jewish people. Hitler lacks those constructive qualities which are essential to a statesman who wishes to become the arbiter of the destinies of the world.

If the British Isles had been detached from our hemisphere and if the New World had not existed we would by now have had a Germanic Empire stretching over three continents, larger in size than the Roman Empire and likely to last the thousand years prophesied by Hitler.

Fortunately for mankind a fine breed of humanity has grown across the seas which is in a position to challenge Hitler's ambition for domination and to replace his Germanic Empire based on slavery by a World Order based on co-operation and justice among nations.

Only two nations beside Germany possess the qualities, economic, political, and spiritual, requisite for world leadership, i.e. the British and the people of the United States. The Soviet Union is, of course, a powerful factor in the world, but, like Germany, it is a continental Power, and like Germany, it will be so mauled and wounded by the struggle that it is safe to predict that it will be fortunate if it has sufficient energy and resources to meet its own needs and undertake its own reconstruction. In any case, the Soviet leaders have themselves renounced claims to world leadership. Moreover, in spite of the immense contribution to collectivist planning, the Soviet Union still lags behind in political experience and industrial efficiency. Notwithstanding its great achievements since the Revolution, and its unbelievable successes on the battlefield, it has still to carry the legacy of ignorance, darkness, and backwardness of previous generations.

England by herself does not possess sufficient strength and will power to lead the world, and the United States are too isolated to undertake world leadership unaided, but England and the United States in combination with the addition of the British Commonwealth have all the necessary qualities for good and effective leadership.

There are more than two hundred million English-speaking people, and if we exclude the larger but more backward communities of China and India, they are numerically the most important group in the world.

This unity of language, of course, does not mean that the

English and the Americans have an identical national character. Racially they are very different. America is a combination of the Anglo-Saxon and European elements, and Steed defined Americans as "a foreign English-speaking nation". The differences between the two groups are notorious, but nevertheless there is unity, not only of language but also of ideals, law, literature, religion and morality. There is diversity but it is a diversity which leads to a higher unity.

It is the most advanced community economically. In a letter to *The Times* L. H. Pike gives figures to illustrate how real national income can be measured in international units, so as to make the figures comparable between one country and another. Such international units have been defined as the quantity of goods and services purchasable with one dollar in the United States during the period 1925-34. He calculates that the real production in terms of international units in the year 1929 was as follows —

REAL PRODUCTION

						<i>Millions</i>
<i>1929</i>	Germany	19,500
	Britain	23,112
	Canada	6,041
	Australia	2,730
	New Zealand	709
	United States	79,000
	Russia	14,710
	China	22,700
	Japan	7,520
<i>1939</i>	Germany	26,200
	Nazi Europe (including Italy and occupied countries)	57,000
	Britain	29,054
	Canada	7,610
	Australia	3,400
	New Zealand	953
	United States	95,400
	Russia	24,200
	Japan	13,470

From these figures it appears that the economic strength of the English-speaking communities is overwhelming. The potential strength is even more so as the British Empire and the United States have not yet exploited their resources to the full.

Geography is a great ally of the Anglo-Saxons. They have been so distributed throughout the world that in every continent they have considerable communities and outposts. England in Europe, the United States in America, and the British Dominions and Colonies in Africa, Asia and Australia. They also possess sea power—the indispensable instrument for the building up of a world community. The Pacific, the Atlantic, the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean, the highways of the world, were controlled and, in spite of the Axis challenge, are still controlled by the Navies of the British Empire and the United States.

For centuries the Anglo-Saxons have been spreading throughout the world and for centuries they have been masters of the seas. Their rise is undoubtedly the most important development in modern history—a supreme testimony to the genius of the race—a work of great design, though so unconsciously and instinctively created. The British Empire, itself led by a nation which is a mixture of Celts, Anglo-Saxons, Danes, Normans, etc., has already been successful in building up a community in which so many peoples and races are members who enjoy varying degrees of self-government, while the United States is a melting-pot of the European races. This leadership, therefore, by reason of its racial and national composition is most likely to be acceptable to the peoples of the world.

The institutions of the Anglo-Saxons (the term is used in its wider sense) are the result of centuries of growth. It has been said that one of the greatest events in British History in the nineteenth century was the revolution which did not take place. It can similarly be said that the greatest event in the twentieth century will be the transition to collectivism without a major upheaval. Churchill in England and Roose-

velt in the United States are the leaders of a silent and orderly revolution. This Anglo-Saxon belief in evolution, combined with the ideal of government in accordance with law, are also likely to increase the trust of the nations and to help in the creation by the English-speaking world of an international order based on law and growth.

The national character of the Anglo-Saxons is devoid of cruelty and political fanaticism. It is carefully trained in the spirit of compromise and objectivity. "Fair play, live and let live, seeing the other fellow's point of view" are some of the guiding maxims of the Anglo-Saxons.

In spite of all appearances to the contrary, the Anglo-Saxon is endowed with a strain of idealism and religious faith. There is no other race, with the possible exception of the Jews, to which the Bible has had such a big appeal. There is no other race in which the ideals of morality and religion play such an important part in the formulation of policy. Puritanism in America and the Protestant spirit in England still have a large say in the conduct of affairs.

Germans or Anglo-Saxons? This is the great issue of the world struggle. The stake is world leadership and the happiness of mankind for untold generations. History, geography, economics, racial make-up, and national character all favour the Anglo-Saxons, but the Germans by a combination of cunning and unprecedented national concentration have become serious challengers in the race.

The dangers of the situation arise from two main causes. One is adaptation to new circumstances. Unlike the French and German attempts at world conquest, the expansion of the English-speaking communities was neither dramatic nor sudden. It was a prosaic affair—the laying of one brick on another. This is its strength, but it has also proved to be a weakness. Today, as a result of the challenge of Hitlerism, the method of "go slow" has had to change to one of rapid acceleration. The question is whether the English-speaking world will be able to catch the new rhythm in time and whether it will be sufficiently roused to the opportunities of

world leadership. The second one is the absence of religious enthusiasm. The vision of a new era has not yet stirred deep emotions in the masses and a gale of religious enthusiasm has not yet swept the world.

Can Israel play a part in the spreading of the message of the new age? For thousands of years the Jewish prophets talked of a world without wars and a world of brotherhood and justice. All the signs point to the consummation and fulfilment of these visions. But Israel is not ready for the mission. It is persecuted, distrusted, and disliked by many. Even in countries where Jews hold positions of influence, they are uneasy. They must always be wary and on the defensive against anti-Semitic insinuations and popular distrust. They dare not voice Jewish hopes and aspirations and are embarrassed by their Jewish connections. How can they play their part in the community of nations without having attained the status of a nation? How can they hope to win the respect of the nations without having won self-respect?

THE MESSIANIC VISION

Some Voices

In the course of the year 1941 several items of news were reported in the Jewish Press which at the time did not attract much attention but which assume a greater significance if taken together, as they are symbolic of the hopes and dreams of these days.

A chassidic Rabbi issued a manifesto in the United States in which he declared that the "arrival of the Messiah is at hand, that the Redemption is drawing near. . . . It is approaching rapidly . . . Citadels will crumble like packs of cards, nations and states will be overthrown over night. The whole world will be shaken, but the word of God will be fulfilled. God's word spoken by his prophets is going to come true and in our own times."

The second item of news is about the Jews of Holland. A New York Yiddish daily published a report on the Jewish position in Holland. It says an atmosphere of Messianic longings and faith prevails among the Dutch Jews, which is reminiscent of the age of Sabbatai Zevi in the seventeenth century. Cultured and rational Jews are fired by the conviction that this temporary triumph of evil cannot last and that a "great Redeemer" will arise to free mankind. The name Hillel is often mentioned and an unpublished song, *Hillel—the saviour of men*, is on many lips, both among Jews and non-Jews. The latter, incidentally, are quite sympathetic to the Jews in their suffering.

The movement—the report goes on—has come to the notice of the Nazi authorities and one of their papers has commented on the subject "the Jews have a naïve belief in the power of the spirit, but we know quite well that only force decides the course of history. Let the Jews play about with Messianism but Hitler will make the decisions."

The third report concerns the Vice-President of the United

States. The world is quite aware of the deep religious faith and sense of destiny which animate the President himself, but not so many know that his "heir apparent", Vice-President Wallace, is a mystic. He quotes the Bible in political discussions and thinks that it has an important bearing on the politics of our own time. Though he is "as American as Indian corn" he believes that the task of man is to build a "Kingdom of Heaven" on this earth.

In an interview published in a New York paper in May the Vice-President expressed his conviction that "Jewish aspirations in Palestine will be realized", and that "the land of the Bible will belong to the people of the Bible . . . and the downfall of Hitler will see the triumph of justice, the end of all wars and a world ruled by the spirit of the prophets".

Do these views represent only the dreams of a few unpractical mystics? Are they cries in the wilderness or will they swell as the days go by to a mighty choir of the whole human race? No one can give an answer to this question. We are all groping in the dark. Some of us have more faith in the future and are even able to detect signs of a new and better world. Others complain that they can see nothing but darkness, that they can discern no light in the blackout of the modern world.

I have raised the Messianic problem—a delicate subject in a modern and sceptical age—because the ordinary men of today search everywhere for a new salvation and because it has been so intimately bound up with Jewish history and with the Jewish conception of the destiny of Israel and mankind.

In fact, the answer to the riddle of Jewish survival is more likely to be found in the Jew's religious mysticism and in his faith in things to come than in any other aspect of his life. To see the Jew as he really is—in all his nakedness but also in his glory and greatness—one has to understand his Messianic longings and religious fervour. Not all Jews, and few Gentiles, have been able to lift the veil and see the reality.

The Messianic urge can be traced to the hopes and visions of the prophets and later to the tribulations of the soul of the Jews in the Roman Empire, which combined with the despair of the Gentiles to give birth to Christianity. But it was the smaller stream of Judaism which carried on the traditions of Messianism. It became the central theme of its history and absorbed the energies and emotions of Jews in every generation.

Messianism is a Jewish conception of things to come and a complex body of thought and speculation about the destiny of Israel and the salvation of mankind which runs through Biblical, Apocalyptic, Talmudical, Cabbalist, Rabbinic, and Zionist literature. It finds a different expression in every age, and one should not be surprised to come across a variety of interpretations and a number of contradictions.

From the speculations of countless generations I have selected some features which should be of some interest to the modern reader and which are relevant to the great events which are taking place before our eyes.

Faith

Messianism implies faith in the rise of a new order for mankind to be created by persons who are divinely appointed for the task. No matter how long they had to wait, no matter what disasters they had to endure, the Jews were enjoined to have faith in ultimate salvation.

The impatient and shortsighted men who prematurely declared the arrival of the Messiah were sternly rebuked by the leaders of the people. Rabbi Jonathan said: "Cursed be those who calculate the Messianic ends. For they would say 'we have calculated the end and he has not arrived, therefore he will never arrive', but you must wait for him, because it is said 'Though he tarry wait for him'." The redemption of Israel has been compared by the Rabbis to childbirth. If a woman gives birth to a child prematurely the child dies. If at term—the child lives. Similarly, Israel's redemption must occur at a moment when everything is ripe for it. Even

Rabbi Akiba was rebuked for acclaiming Bar Cochba as the Messiah in these words: "We shall sooner see grass growing on your cheek than the arrival of the son of David."

Maimonides summed up the attitude of Judaism on the subject in his thirteen Principles of Faith: "I believe with perfect faith in the coming of Messiah, and though he tarry I will wait for his coming."

Rabbi Jonathan Eybeschütz (1690-1764) attempted to explain why the date of Jewish redemption had not been given to the Jews. If the Jewish exiles had known how long they had to wait and suffer before Redemption comes, they would not have consented to wait but would have committed suicide.

Pseudo-Messiahs

The Jews seldom gave expression to their Messianic dreams and speculations outside their homes and colleges. There day and night Jewish mystics sought contact with deeper reality, searched for the secrets of the Universe and dreamed of the salvation of their people.

Occasionally, however, when the cup of suffering would overflow, the Jew—impatient of waiting and dreaming—would rise in revolt against the foreign oppressor or against the established Jewish authorities.

Jewish history has many a story to tell about such revolts and their unhappy sequels. A bare mention of some of the more important of these movements should suffice.

At the end of the second century A.D. the Jews were involved in a series of disorders and fights in the Eastern Mediterranean. The rebellion, which caused a great deal of anxiety to the Roman authorities, was particularly serious in Palestine, where Bar Cochba was acclaimed as the hero and the Messiah.

In the fifth century "Moses of Crete" promised the Jews of that island that he would divide the sea and lead them on dry land to Palestine—a promise which ended in many Jews leaving their possessions behind and being drowned in the sea.

In the twelfth century David Alroy—the Jewish Napoleon—led an unsuccessful rebellion against the Moslem Sultans and died a tragic death.

In the sixteenth century David Reubeni appeared in Italy and claimed that there was a Jewish kingdom in North Arabia, that he was the brother of Joseph its ruler, and that he was sent by his brother to obtain the assistance of Christendom against the Turks. He was received by the Pope and the King of Portugal and created a stir among the Jewish communities in Europe. In the end he and his disciple, Solomon Molcho, aroused the suspicions of the Emperor Charles the Fifth, whose help and friendship they had sought. Both were arrested by the Emperor's orders and handed over to the Inquisition. Molcho was burnt at the stake in 1532 and Reubeni died a prisoner of the Inquisition in Spain.

In the seventeenth century, under the influence of the Jewish Cabballists (and also of English mystics) and the suffering of the Jews in Europe, an ascetic and magnetic personality appeared on the Jewish scene, proclaiming that he was the Messiah, divinely appointed to depose the Sultan and restore the Jews to Palestine.

The excitement of the Jews throughout the Diaspora rose to a great pitch. Not only the Jews of the Turkish Empire but also Jews living among the Slavs and even in Hamburg, London, and Amsterdam were caught up in the current. The infatuation of the Jews with Sabbati Zevi did not cease even after his pitiful failure and conversion to Islam.

In the eighteenth century Jacob Frank fought Rabbis of Poland and proclaimed that it was his mission to save the Jews from the authority of the Talmud. After a series of remarkable adventures, including the staging of a Disputation between his followers and the Rabbis, the conversion of the sect to Catholicism and a triumphant tour from country to country in Europe, the movement collapsed and disappeared.

The story of these deluded and unhappy men is too long to be told here in detail, but a few instructive points emerge from it.

The Jewish masses and even their leaders have always been eager to respond to Messianic claims; Messianism has been a powder magazine in the history of the Jews.

The pseudo-Messiahs have been subjected to criticism and ridicule and their impotence has been revealed before the world. They should not, however, be lightly dismissed as frauds and charlatans. They are an expression of a deep and innate longing. They are portents of history and can perhaps be compared to the experiments of a scientist who works by the method of trial and error until he stumbles upon the right solution. They may have been the errors which lead to ultimate success.

Jewish Conception of History

The Jews discerned a design and a plot in the history of Mankind and Israel. They regarded it as a series of events and a succession of empires which were destined to lead to the removal of the kingdom of wickedness and violence, and to the establishment of the kingdom of Heaven.

The Rabbis divided history into three main phases: (1) Two thousand years devoid of Law; (2) Two thousand years under the rule of Law; (3) Two thousand years of great struggles and disasters which will end in the triumph of the Messiah. The Rabbis even enumerated ten world rulers, who would succeed each other, their rule culminating in the rule of the Messiah and finally of God. The best interpretation of *Chad Gadyah*—the popular song which concludes the Seder celebration on Passover—is that it is symbolic of the course of history. The father is God and the kid is Israel and the forces which overwhelm each other in turn are the despotic powers. The song ends by proclaiming the triumph of God, the inference being that the universe is governed by divine justice.

Great Upheavals

The Messianic Age will be preceded by great upheavals such as the overthrow of established institutions, famine,

floods, frost, plagues, and wars. According to the Talmud it will be heralded by unusual and strange human behaviour. "Arrogance will be on the increase and honour will be degraded. . . . Scholarship will be perverted; men who fear sin will be in disfavour; truth will be absent; the men of this generation will be as ferocious as dogs; young men will insult old people, grown-ups will have to stand up before youths; a son will swear at his father; a daughter will rise against her mother and her mother-in-law; a house will be divided against itself and a son will not have shame in the presence of his father." Prices will rise and hunger and poverty will be universal. One Rabbi expressed the view that "the son of David will only come when everyone has lost his last penny".

The Rabbis thought that the catastrophe would be so overwhelming that previous sufferings would fade into insignificance. A man made a journey on foot and he came across a wolf. He was saved from the wolf and went on telling everybody he met the story of the wolf. Then he encountered a lion, he was again saved and went on telling everybody about the lion. Then he encountered a snake and was saved once more. He forgot all about the wolf and the lion and talked only about the snake. This will also happen to Israel. The final disasters will obliterate the memory of earlier disasters.

Temporary Supremacy of Evil and its Ultimate Overthrow

One feature common to both Christian and Jewish literature is the rise of a wicked person who will cast his spell on humanity.

The Christian apocalypticists talk of Satan or Belial—the world deceiver—who in the guise of the son of God will perform miracles, and as a ruler of the earth will commit unheard-of crimes, while the Jews of the Gaonic Age created the story of Armilus, the king (blind in one eye and deaf in one ear) who will oppress the Jews in the end of days.

From Ezekiel's vision of the invasion of Palestine by Gog from the land of Magog, the Rabbis derived the belief that

the Messianic Age would be preceded by a tremendous battle, fought on the Mountains of Palestine, in which the evil barbarians of the North under the leadership of Gog would be decisively defeated.

The Restoration of the Jews to Palestine

The Restoration of the Jews to Palestine is one of the principal topics of Jewish prophecy and literature throughout the ages "Therefore, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt But, the Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them and they shall dwell in their own land" (Jeremiah xxiii) "And I will bring them out from the people, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them to their own land, and feed them upon the mountains of Israel by the rivers, and in all the inhabited places of the country . . . I will seek that which was lost, and bring again that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick: but I will destroy the fat and the strong; I will feed them with judgment" (Ezekiel xxxiv).

The Rabbis attached such importance to the return of the Jews to Palestine that one of them went so far as to say that the "significance of the Restoration would be as great as that of the Creation". Even today the Jews pray daily for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and shout every Passover, "Next year in Jerusalem"

The salvation of Israel will not occur at once. Rabbi Chiyah and Rabbi Simon were walking in the valley of Arbel and saw the rise of the dawn Said Rabbi Chiyah to Rabbi Simon "In this manner will the redemption of Israel occur. At first it will be slow and gradual and then it will gather strength and rapidity."

The Regeneration of the World

'The return of Israel to his native soil will be followed by the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven which will arise on the ruins of a world conflagration.

One of the greatest and noblest passages of the Bible describes the vision of a universal peace: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths. for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people. and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Isaiah 11).

Another well-known passage in the Messianic vision occurs in Isaiah, chapter eleven. "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid: and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together: and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

Fertility of earth, happiness of mind and of body will be universal. "And judgments and accusations and contention and vengeance and blood and passions and envy and hatred, and whatsoever things are like these, shall go away into condemnation when they have been removed. For these are the things that have filled the world with evil, and on account of these things the life of man has been greatly disturbed" (Baruch).

"The children of man shall become older from generation to generation and from day to day till their life time approaches a thousand years. And there shall be none old or weary of life but they shall all be like children and boys, and shall finish all their day in peace and gladness" (*The Book of Jubilees*).

No Supernatural Miracles

It is true that the popular imagination of the Jews ran riot with stories and dreams of miracles which would be performed in the days of redemption and that the emphasis was on a personal Messiah rather than an abstract idea of a new order. The forerunner of the Messiah would be of the tribe of Ephraim who would precede the son of David and who, according to some accounts, would be slain in the battle of Gog and Magog, but then the real Messiah would appear and he "will kill the super-human hostile leader with the breath of his mouth".

It is also interesting to note that the Jews have a tradition embodied in countless songs and stories about a great banquet which would take place when evil is vanquished. The righteous, the tradition runs, would participate in an enormous meal, consisting of delicious wines stored since the days of creation and portions of meat cut off from the most gigantic mammoths of sea and earth.

The responsible leaders of Jewry, however, have never taken these accounts literally and have discouraged belief in miracles. Maimonides, for example, said: "Let it not enter upon your minds that the Messiah will perform miracles, or create new things or resurrect the dead, we must await nothing of the kind."

In a letter to the Jews of Yemen, Maimonides gives his view on the claims of a false Messiah who appeared at that time. "I am not at all surprised to hear of the transactions of him in South Arabia, who proclaims himself the Messiah, nor of the credulity of his adherents. The man is beyond doubt demented. . . . The conditions which cannot be waived

in the character of the Redeemer are also wisdom, vigour, and riches, which requisites have been so explained; he must be wise in forecasting consequences, vigorous in holding his actions under proper control, and rich in mental resources. . . . Now the signs of the man's poverty of intellect are the circumstances surrounding his assumed Messiahship."

In earlier times a Babylonian (Rabbi Samuel) went so far as to insist that the liberation of the Jews from foreign oppression would be the main difference between the Messianic and previous ages.

No Utopia

Moses Hess once referred to England as the nerve centre of humanity. Judah Halevi referred to Israel as the heart among nations. The two maxims can explain why the salvation of both the English and the Jews is so closely connected with the world as a whole.

The world of today has become such a complete unit that the health and happiness of each member is of great concern to the others. This is particularly so with regard to the English and the Jews who are spread throughout the world and who are particularly sensitive to the beat of humanity and its disorders.

The Jews cannot seek their salvation independently of the world, nor can the world find its happiness regardless of the Jews. The Jews are so insinuated in the organisms of humanity that the health of humanity is a supreme concern to them, while their health is of a supreme concern to humanity.

The Jews will be privileged to play an honourable part in the rise of the new dawn—a part sanctified and justified by their long martyrdom, religious idealism, ability and experience. But it will also involve them in great responsibilities.

The Jews for one thing cannot afford an arrogant or tactless chauvinism. In the same way that it is necessary to convince the anti-nationalist Jew of the need for Jewish nationalism, so it is necessary to convince every nationalist Jew of the need for a thoroughgoing internationalism. For the Jews, like the

Anglo-Saxons, are a people destined by history and geography to outgrow narrow particularism and to gain a wide horizon.

The Jews, like the Anglo-Saxons, cannot afford to pursue selfish or immoral policies. They cannot attempt to do anything which is contrary to the conscience of the nations or anything which cannot stand the test of an objective and impartial examination. Not only is it unwise for a weak nation—so dependent for sympathy and help on others—to behave in a manner likely to estrange the nations, but it is also unjust, and Israel is a moral being and is inherently incapable of injustice. It is better that Israel should perish than that it should be in league with Satan, for Israel and Satan cannot live together.

Above all, the Jews in their enthusiasm for the new age, should beware of falling into the trap of Utopianism.

The more realistic of the Rabbis said that the Messianic age would not mean the end of the world as we know it but the beginning of a new stage of development in the story of mankind. It must not be assumed, therefore, that human beings will suddenly change their nature, that struggle or hard work will be unnecessary or that the Jewish problem, which in Europe has assumed the form of an acute disease, could be solved by the proclamation of a new Utopia or by international slogans. Grave problems of reconstruction both among Jews and other nations will have to be tackled and these will absorb the energies of generations and will probably take centuries to complete.

What is really meant by a new era is the creation of a new framework within which nations could work out their destiny. If international wars—which for thousands of years have eaten up the fruit of human endeavour—could be abolished, if the resources of the world could be equitably distributed among nations, and if class and civil wars could be eliminated from the internal life of nations by the setting up of a just and efficient economic and political system—then the great revolution—perhaps the greatest in the annals of man—will have begun. The new era prophesied by Jewish visionaries and mystics will have become a reality.

PART III

BUILDING A STATE

SEEDS

IT is a truism to say that the struggle for the liberation of the Jewish people is fundamentally different from that of any other nation. The Greeks, the Italians, and the Poles lived during their period of subjection and were so rooted in the land that their foreign masters were unable to hold them down indefinitely. The oppressed nations had only to wait for the right historical moment in order to get rid of the alien rulers. The Jewish National Movement, on the other hand, has faced a far more difficult and more complicated problem. In order that the Jews should attain their liberty in Palestine the Jews must first be in Palestine. This remains to a large extent the problem of today, but it was more so when Zionism started on its career. It had practically to create something out of nothing and start from zero, and it has rightly been said that the journey from zero to one is more difficult than from one to ten.

A medieval Jewish Rabbi once wrote that the salvation of Israel would occur in stages. First there would be a small token gathering of Jews in Palestine with Government approval, then considerable additions and finally the complete Restoration.

This is what has actually occurred. The Yishuv⁷ grew gradually, at first slowly and then gathering momentum. Many men, movements and trends converged, sometimes independently of each other, to give birth to the Yishuv. They included Spanish mystics, pious Jews from Eastern Europe, the institutions of charity, the educational organizations from Western Europe, the Lovers of Zion, Rothschild and the Zionists.

Before the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, the Jewish population in Palestine was negligible. Benjamin Tudela, the noted Jewish traveller, who visited Palestine in 1170, found in it only a few hundred families living in degradation and

fear. A Rabbi's account of his settlement in Palestine in 1267 is even more depressing. He arrived a few years after the Mongol invasion and found that the Jewish community had been almost annihilated. In a letter to his son he wrote: "What shall I write to you about our country? It is forsaken and desolate. The holier the place, the greater its state of neglect. Jerusalem is the most desolate locality and Judea's condition is worse than that of Galilee."

Another Rabbi, who settled in Palestine in 1488, has also a sad story to tell. He found in Jerusalem only seventy Jewish households out of a total of four thousand, and these Jewish families were almost without means of support "A person who can get bread for a whole year is considered rich these days. There are many old and lonely widows . . . about seven women to one man."

The sixteenth century, however, saw the growth of the Holy Cities, the creation in Galilee and Judea of spiritual and religious centres for the whole of Jewry, the experiment by Don Joseph of Naxos to colonize the region of Tiberias, and the settlement of Jewish mystics in the country.

They were visionaries who were fired by Messianic ideals and by great longings and love for their people. On the mountains and in the caves of Galilee they prayed, feasted, sang, wept and longed for the redemption of Israel. They poured out their souls in prayer and song and expected a supernatural and miraculous salvation.

The futility of these mystics must not blind us to their achievements. They kindled hope in hard-pressed Jewry and by their example attracted disciples to Palestine. They built a tiny but all-important foundation-stone in the structure of the Yishuv.

In the course of this century the Spanish and Portuguese Jews became the predominant element in the Yishuv and assimilated other elements. In spite of a steady East and Central European immigration during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Spanish Jewish community remained in numbers and quality superior to that of the Northern Jewish

community, and this superiority was not reversed until the nineteenth century.

In the seventeenth century a charitable institution grew up—an institution which helped to maintain Jewish life in Palestine. It had its origin in the year 1601 when, as a result of famine, earthquake, and persecution, the Jews of Venice, in answer to the call for aid from the Holy Land, came to the rescue. Their example was followed by other Jewish communities of the Diaspora and it became a permanent organization which maintained a comparatively large number of Jews on the charity of their pious brethren abroad.

It was a degrading institution. Its beneficiaries were parasites, reactionaries, and fatalists. They were rightly described by the Arabs as "The Sons of Death". But it had two merits. Its *Mesulachim* (the men who were sent to collect the funds) kept alive in the Diaspora the sentimental attachment to Palestine. Secondly, it led to a considerable growth in the populations of the Holy Cities. Moreover, the children of these unprogressive Jews have been slowly but surely turned away from the example of their parents and are being recruited in the constructive work of Zionism.

In addition to this institution, charitable organizations from Western and Central Europe later came on to the Palestinian scene. The best known is the Alliance Israélite founded in the year 1860, and which established in the year 1870 the first agricultural school in Palestine. The aims of this organization were to work for the emancipation of the Jews and to lend support to those who suffer through being Jews. It opened a number of schools in Palestine and its example was followed by English and German Jews.

The Evelina de Rothschild School was supported by English Jews and there were schools run by the *Hilfsverein* of German Jews. These educational societies were, in addition, the instruments of spreading French, English, and German culture respectively. The *Hilfsverein* was founded by German Jews in 1901 for the purpose of developing the moral, cultural, and economic development of their co-religionists,

particularly in Eastern Europe and Asia. By 1913 it had become the most important educational organization in the country and had twenty-seven schools under its control. It far outstripped its French rival and by its attempts (which were successfully resisted) to Germanize Jewish life in Palestine, became a menace to the primacy of Hebrew in the educational system.

All these organizations disavowed any political aims. Their object was merely to better the condition of their "co-religionists", and they regarded themselves as the bearers of European culture. The Lovers of Zion, the forerunners of the Zionist Movement, was the first organization for which national colonization and not charity was the motive of action. The society was founded in Russia but for political reasons was compelled to register in 1890 under the safe title of a society whose object was to encourage agricultural settlement of Jews in Palestine. In 1897, when Dr. Herzl issued the call for the first Zionist Congress, the Lovers of Zion merged with the Zionist organization.

The colonies founded by the Lovers of Zion and other colonizing societies soon found themselves in a bad way. Lack of resources and lack of experience brought them to the verge of disaster and they were only saved from it by the generous intervention of Baron Edmund Rothschild. More than any single individual, Baron Rothschild is responsible for the success of early Jewish colonization. The whole Zionist experiment would have perhaps collapsed if the Zionists could not have drawn on the experience and resources of the Rothschild colonies. It was rightly pointed out by a Zionist leader: "Without the Rothschild colonies we would not have succeeded but without us his work would have come to nothing."

Strangely enough, the aim of Baron Edmund Rothschild—"the Father of Colonization"—in Palestine was not the establishment of a Jewish State. In February 1920, Max Nordau described to a Zionist audience in England an interview which he had had with the Baron about his work in

Palestine. "I told him", said Nordau, "that he was a powerful Zionist and that he spent 60,000,000 frs. for the Rothschild colonies in Palestine. Why did you do it if you had no idea of building up a Jewish Commonwealth? 'No, no,' protested the Baron, 'that was not my idea at all, my idea was this; I was in Palestine I travelled and fell in love with the flourishing German colonies I saw beautiful Catholic convents in one street surrounded by gardens and orchards and wonderful sights, I saw Protestant Schools and Assembly Halls, Orphanages, and Hospitals, I saw fine Russian villages where long-bearded monjiks in their caftans tilled the soil and seemed prosperous. The only people I did not see were the Jews I saw some Sephardic Jews in the smaller places who took no interest in outside Jewry I saw ragged old Jews in Jerusalem all leading a mendicant's life, living on the *Haluka* I said to myself, this is a shame. We must have a specimen of Jews here Beside the German colonist, beside the Russians, beside the monks and missionaries, we must have some Jews.'" His idea was to form a kind of museum. To put in a few Jews as antiquities and relics to be admired by visitors

Nevertheless he was a lover of Zion and after the last war he became closely associated with political Zionism and lived to see the historical importance of his contribution to the Jewish struggle for a home

The achievements of the Jews in pre-war Palestine are the more remarkable since they took place in an unfriendly environment. When Turkey was mighty it had a traditional friendship for the Jews. During its period of decline, the Jewish position in the Turkish Empire deteriorated, particularly as a result of Sabbati Zevi's Messianic adventures. The Turkish Government became suspicious of Zionism and put every obstacle in the path of the colonists. In 1891 they attempted to prevent Jewish immigration by the institution of a red ticket which restricted the stay of the newcomers to three months. The acquisition of land and its tenure became increasingly difficult. "Our colonies", said Weizmann, "never

felt secure, never could expand freely, no work of a great character could be undertaken, Jewish energy and Jewish capital hesitated to venture into Palestine and so we were condemned to carry on the work with great sacrifice and enormous waste, an effort which yielded only a comparatively small return ”

In view of the difficulties which Jewish colonization encountered in Palestine, two schools arose in the Zionist Movement. One school laid emphasis on securing favourable political conditions for mass colonization and the other was prepared to continue practical work in spite of all obstacles. Herzl, the chief exponent of political Zionism, said that colonization must not be based on the mistaken principle of gradual infiltration “An infiltration is bound to end badly. It continues till the inevitable moment when the native population feels itself threatened and forces the Government to stop further influx of Jews. Immigration is consequently futile unless based on an assured supremacy ” Turkey, it was argued, viewed Jewish activities with suspicion and hostility. So long as the Turks were the masters of the country it was unwise to go on working because it meant creating wealth for these masters. Their slogan was “not another cow, not another house”.

To the Western Jew it was very humiliating to hear that a Jewish State could ultimately be created by the process of smuggling a few Jews into Palestine through the back door. Jewish colonization, the political Zionists said, must be based on a legal right and must be recognized by international law.

Hence Herzl's desperate efforts to secure from the Sultan a charter by offering to help Turkey to recover from its financial bankruptcy. He thought that if Jewish financial circles were to assist Turkey, the Sultan would be willing to grant him a charter for the colonization of Palestine.

Herzl, however, failed to secure real financial backing and the Sultan was evasive, saying neither yes nor no. It must be admitted, however, that Herzl's judgment with regard to Jewish millionaires and financiers was at fault. He was taken

aback when he learned from bitter experience of their narrow local interests, of their cringing subservience to the Government of the day in whatever country they lived and of their complete lack of vision. "The Jews with ideas", he said, "have no money. And the Jews with money have no ideas."

Both Herzl and the Sultan became suspicious of each other and a vicious circle was created which was aptly described by Herzl himself. "Give me the money and I will obtain the charter. Give me the charter and I will obtain the money."

The failure of Zionist diplomacy before the first world war encouraged the practical Zionists to believe that the salvation of Zion would not come from the diplomats but from the tangible achievements of Jewish colonization in the country, and after Herzl's death in 1904 this trend gradually became the dominant one.

The idea that a Jewish State could be built by a process of growth was disputed by the political Zionists Max Nordau, reviewing the achievements of Zionist colonization before the war of 1914, said "By itself it would not have sufficed. By itself it would have been doomed to perish, because struggling colonies with a few thousand settlers in the midst of a foreign empire could never really have become by an organic process, a Jewish Commonwealth."

Looking back at this controversy, from the vantage point of the present day, one cannot help thinking how right both schools were. The divergence of opinion was really unnecessary as both were different aspects of the same problem and were complementary to each other. Practical work was necessary in order to create the nucleus of nationhood. Political work was essential in order that this nucleus should not perish in unfavourable surroundings.

On the eve of the war of 1914 the practical Zionists could point to the increase of the Jewish population in Palestine from 25 to 35 thousand in 1880 to 80 to 100 thousand in 1914, to the establishment of 45 colonies with 15,000 Jewish

farmers, to a Jewish system of education with Hebrew as a national language and to the *Vaadim*⁸ in the towns and colonies which were to serve as the seeds of Jewish self-government.

The political Zionists, on the other hand, could claim that they had aroused the national consciousness not only among Jews in Eastern Europe, but also among the wealthier and more assimilated Jews of the West, that they had created an organization which was the framework of a future national home, and that being the main implement of political propaganda it accustomed the non-Jewish world to the existence of the Jewish nationalism and its claims to Palestine. Zionism thus became a world-wide problem, and the Balfour Declaration thus became possible.

The balance sheet of Zionism for that period is perhaps not so impressive, having regard to the magnitude of the Jewish question. Human inertia, however, is a formidable factor and the Jews being a scattered race are particularly susceptible to it. Moreover, all States and Empires had small beginnings. Rome was built on Seven Hills and New Judea on a few colonies. No nation has come into being suddenly, because the mills of nationhood grind slowly.

FRUSTRATION

THE end of the last war brought many illusions to the world. "The war to end war", "a country fit for heroes to live in", "the making of the world safe for Democracy"—these were some of the slogans that were current in that era of illusions. People thought they had found the remedies of all the ills of mankind and believed that the treaties and institutions which they created were permanent and imperishable.

The Balfour Declaration was such a brilliant success for Zionism that even an old and, by reputation, an astute people was blinded and deceived by the flashing and momentary splendour of those days. The excitement prevailing in the Jewish world can well be imagined. Jewish papers went even to the length of publishing lists of the new Jewish Cabinet, and argued who was to be the best Prime Minister or ambassador to France. This is hardly surprising, because British public opinion was also thrilled by the great historical event, and encouraged the belief in the imminence of a new kingdom for the Jews. British statesmen (Chamberlain, Winston Churchill, the Cecils and many others) spoke of the rise of a Jewish State and the British Press unanimously greeted the establishment of a "Jewish Commonwealth".

After the fever had subsided the Jews began to wake up to realities. They realized that the Jewish State existed only on paper and even that paper was couched in vague terms. It began to dawn on them that the Balfour Declaration was a promise which might or might not be honoured.

The first important issue the Zionists had to face after the announcement of the Declaration was whether they should demand from the Peace Conference the immediate setting up of a Jewish State or only the creation of such conditions that might lead to it. Israel Zangwill, the territorialist, and Max Nordau, the veteran Zionist, argued for striking while the iron was hot and, therefore, for an immediate and radical

solution. Weizmann and his colleagues pressed for moderation and gradualness.

Zangwill advocated the gradual and amicable emigration of the majority of the Arabs from the tiny territory of Palestine and criticized Weizmann's plan of peaceful penetration. "Even if it (Weizmann's plan) does not propose to sit on the Arab's head it does propose to snow him under, and ethically I can see no difference between destroying his position gradually or act at one stroke. Indeed, ethically it seems to me finer to make an honest, open, friendly Wilsonian bargain with him than to undertake the slow combative process of swamping him. . . . Lord Morley tells us in his autobiography that the power in every land resides in the land-owning classes. Yet over 3,000 Arab landowners and some 600,000 Fellahin are to continue in possession of the bulk of the Holy Soil. While Czechoslovaks and the Yugoslavs and still other people scarcely known to history are to flourish on their own soil with all the apparatus of sovereignty, the greatest and longest martyred of all the oppressed peoples—a people which has supplied no small proportion of the outstanding figures of the world crisis, and in whose literature this new era finds its inspiration—is to crawl into a corner of its own like a leper colony, warned to keep off that, or to keep away from this Jew or from that Jew and repeating on its own soil the humiliations and subservience of its two thousand years of agony and ignominy. Such a Palestine has neither the glamour of poetry nor the practicability of prose. It's neither Jewish nor National nor a Home."

In December 1918 Weizmann addressed a public meeting in the East End of London and strongly defended his policy: "People were asking what shall the Jews demand in the Peace Conference? With characteristic exaggeration some put impossible demands, others turn away in dark despair. It was their duty to keep their heads, to be wise. There were those who argued that the Jews must get a Jewish State. If the Poles, Yugoslavs, and Czechoslovaks could get a State why not the Jewish People? it was asked. Surely Jews were of as

noble descent and of as ancient a line as any of these newly-formed States. Very true. If the length of pedigree and nobility of lineage counted, they should long ago have had their rights. But those were not enough. To have a Jewish State in Palestine the Jews must first be in Palestine, and the Jewish people was not in Palestine. There were only 100,000 Jews as against more than 600,000 non-Jews. Lands were not given to people who did not inhabit them. It was his sacred duty to say that it was not only unwise but positively unjust to ask the Peace Conference for a Jewish State. They needed a Jewish majority in Palestine. Until they had such a majority the land must be administered by a 'Trustee Power.'

At the Peace Conference in 1919 the Jews presented their claims demanding the creation of such conditions as to enable an annual immigration of 50-60 thousand, so that ultimately Palestine would become a Jewish State. The principle of the Mandate was approved in San Remo in 1920 and the detailed draft in 1922. It is said that the moderation of the Zionist claims caused Lloyd George to remark, "Weizmann is the only modest man in the Conference."

The question whether a Jewish State could or could not have been secured in the years immediately following the war is not so much of historical and academic importance, though the "ifs" of history are always a fascinating subject, as of political importance. It provides a useful lesson for future political conduct. Undoubtedly the immediate setting up of a Jewish State could be ruled out as impracticable and premature, if only because a small and weak Jewish community in Palestine could not assume the functions of government and the control of a large and hostile Arab majority. Nevertheless, was it not possible to secure the recognition of Jewish sovereignty over the land and the quick transformation of the country into a Jewish State with the help of British and Jewish forces? Above all, was it wise to acquiesce in the loose terminology of the Declaration and other political documents?

Half the trouble which Zionism had to face in the following

years arose from the fact that the legal position of Zionism was vague and uncertain. How much unnecessary suffering could have been avoided if both Arabs and Jews had known where they stood. Instead British and Zionist politicians courted vagueness and found shelter in the much abused phrase of the National Home.

It is true that the Basle programme of 1897 also avoided the phrase "a Jewish State". But then Palestine was an integral part of the Turkish Empire and Zionism was not in a position to challenge the sovereignty of Turkey. After the war, on the other hand, the status of Palestine in International Law was entirely recast.

Nevertheless some influential Zionist leaders found it the height of wisdom to eliminate the Jewish State from the Zionist vocabulary. For instance, in November 1919 N. Sokolow said in a speech: "The question was asked—what is a National Home? He was surprised at that question, because it was twenty-two years since they had adopted the Basle programme and if a National Home had been clearly understood by Zionists all those years he did not know why it should not be understood now. On the other hand, he did not understand what was meant by a Jewish State. Was it to be a Jewish Kingdom, a Republic or a Jewish Independent Commonwealth?"

The result of such quibbling was that Palestine became a "Rebecca for Edom and Israel", each struggling for supremacy. The question whether this was an ethical arrangement cannot in the light of experience even be raised. It is obvious that a quick operation would have been preferable to the continuous bleeding. The question which remains, however, is whether such an operation was possible. Zangwill thought that it was and expressed this opinion to the American Jewish Congress in 1923. "I shall always remain persuaded that a Jewish State was possible at the moment when the Arab was a defeated enemy, liberated from the Turk and glad enough to take on any political impress; but by a policy of radical distribution such as is now in operation between the

Greeks and the Turks under the Treaty of Lausanne combined with full compensation for expropriating land, the difficulty of making a home out of a territory in which we are only one out of nine inhabitants and in which our total holdings are still below 4 per cent would have been largely removed. I shall believe that at the critical moment the Zionist leadership, unconscious of the living forces behind it such as have already existed in Palestine or found expression in the *Haluzim*, failed in nerve and will power. But the hour of destiny has passed. A great moment found, as Herzl had foreboded, a small people."

This view is not confined to a Zionist D'Annunzio like Zangwill, but is also shared by a weighty and august body like the Peel Commission. "It has sometimes crossed our minds", says the report, "that this conversion (i.e. of Palestine into a Jewish State) might conceivably have been accomplished once and for all as an act of war. In terms of *Realpolitik* the British had conquered the country from the Turks, and were entitled to do what they liked with it. If any Arab contribution to victory had been ignored and any undertaking to them brushed aside and if the new frontier had at once been drawn and the new Jewish State at once established, it is possible, perhaps, that the Arabs would by now have acquiesced. But it is far harder to imagine the conversion of Palestine into a Jewish State in the present circumstances, as, so to speak, an act of peace."

Perhaps it is unfair to lay the blame entirely on the Zionist leadership. In spite of Zionist preparations and propaganda the Jewish masses were not ready for the great moment and missed the tide. The chaos and disorganization after the war were so great that Zionism, though strong, did not seem, at least on the surface, strong enough to undertake such an offensive. British politicians, too, might have recoiled before such a drastic but necessary step. The three factors in the situation, Zionist leadership, British statesmanship, and the Jewish masses, all reacted upon each other and all three must shoulder the responsibility for missing a great historical opportunity.

In the early '20s it became clear that even the status of Zionism as defined by the Moderates was in danger. Zionism was rapidly losing ground and, far from being able to assume the offensive, stood entirely on the defensive.

The year of 1922 marked the climax of a great defeat to the Zionist cause, and the wounds inflicted then are still open, even today. The White Paper of that year repudiated the interpretation of Dr Weizmann that Palestine was ultimately to become as Jewish as England is English. It defined "National Home" as follows "When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish Nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride."

In this conception of Zionism lies so much of the tragedy of Palestine. It did untold harm by obscuring the real meaning of the National Home and by substituting phrases which were intended to evade the issue. It further demoralized the Jew without completely strangling him and gave hope to the Arab that by resisting Zionism he might defeat it altogether. In the second place, it deprived Zionism of its greatness and consequently of its validity. The Zionist claim that the pressing needs of Jewish nationalism must override the ambitions of the local Arabs loses its point when Palestine is regarded as a toy and luxury to some wealthy Jews abroad who "take interest and pride" in the achievements of the Jewish community in Palestine. To the Jewish masses Palestine is a matter of life and death—not another country place to be visited and admired during the summer holidays.

The year 1922 also saw the first partition of Palestine through the exclusion of Transjordan from the National Home. The last draft of 1922 gave the Mandatory permission "to postpone or withhold application of such provisions

of the Mandate as it may consider inapplicable to local conditions". Emir Abdulla was installed in Amman and the country became Judenrein.

The exclusion of Transjordan was perhaps a greater calamity than the White Paper. The case of Zionism, that it provides a major solution to the Jewish Problem, can be established beyond doubt if Transjordan is included within Palestine. It has an area of 34,000 square miles as compared with 10,000 in Western Palestine. Palestine and Transjordan together comprise an area almost as big as England. The population of Transjordan is about 300,000 compared with about a million and a half in Palestine proper. The backwardness and stagnation of that country are proverbial. The budget of Tel-Aviv alone compares favourably with that of the whole kingdom. In Transjordan time is of little account; as a recent traveller put it, the "Ministers yawn and the Emir plays chess".

The political defeats of 1922 were not an accident, but an outcome of many factors antagonistic to Jewish aspirations. These were to be found in a long hostile front, ranging from Jerusalem to London and from Paris to Rome. This powerful coalition had an easy prey because the Jews' powers of resistance were almost negligible. Pathetically and meekly they submitted and just bent under the blow. To start with, the local position in Palestine was very disquieting. In April 1920 anti-Jewish riots occurred in Jerusalem and in May 1921 even more serious bloodshed took place in Jaffa. These massacres were a bolt from the blue to the Jews. The fact that pogroms could take place in their land of liberty hurt and humiliated their self-respect. In Russia Cossacks used to lead the rioting mobs and in Palestine it was the Arab police. In Russia the Czar's officials were the main instigators, and in Palestine they could not help suspecting certain British officials of passivity or acquiescence.

Since the military occupation of Palestine the British Administration was extremely jealous and even hostile to Jewish activities in the country. The working of the mind of

the average English official was summed up as follows: "The English officer regarded the Balfour Declaration as damn' nonsense, the Jews, as damn' nuisance and natives into the bargain and the Arabs as damn' good fellows." The higher officials, particularly during the military occupation, regarded the Zionist organization as usurping the functions of government and as introducing an element of unrest and, therefore, from the purely administrative point of view, highly inconvenient.

Reference to Lord Samuel must be made here since the importance of the role played by him in the period of Zionist frustration cannot be overestimated.

Samuel is an able administrator and has been described as the unique Home Secretary who, by virtue of his passion for detail, could hold his own with the permanent officials of the Home Office. But his enemies and even some of his friends believe that he lacks strength of character. The risk of putting such charming but weak personality in charge of Palestine was, strangely enough, not understood by the Zionists, who hailed his appointment as a great victory. Non-Zionists, however, saw the danger. *The Spectator*, for example, said: "We have no prejudice against Sir Herbert Samuel, either personal or racial. We believe him to be an honest and experienced if somewhat timid and weak-hearted administrator. His experience, his wealth, his political adroitness, his capacity for hard work might have been good reasons for putting Sir Herbert Samuel in a Home post. To put him where he has been put is an outrage."

Lord Curzon, in the debate in the House of Lords at the end of June 1920, showed a remarkable insight into the character of Samuel which was very reassuring to the enemies of Zionism. He said: "I had the honour of serving as a colleague with him in Mr. Asquith's administration for a year and a half and though I do not think any of his then Liberal colleagues are now in the House, I am sure all will agree with me in saying that he takes to the discharge of his duties there a mind of singular impartiality and fairness. I have had

many opportunities of discussing the matter with him and, while it may be true that when he goes there he will for a time find himself in somewhat difficult circumstances with the Arabs, a great authority on the country told me the other day that six months later he was quite certain he would be equally unpopular with the Jews. That was his testimony to the character of Sir Herbert which I expect is not unlikely to be borne out by facts."

Throughout the term of his office, Sir Herbert took good care to keep his reputation for "impartiality" in England. He even became more "impartial" than he had expected at the time of his appointment. After his arrival in Palestine he was taken aback by the noisy and loud opposition of Arab politicians backed by an anti-Zionist administration. In England he had underestimated the Arab problem in Palestine, but on the spot he so overestimated it that it haunted him and gave him no rest. Being a Liberal he succumbed to Arab agitation and being very English he easily surrendered to the subtle pressure of his British underlings. His policy became very simple—conciliate the Arab at any price.

When criticizing his record of administration in Palestine the Zionists with some bitterness point out the following facts: (1) He believed that he could win the hearts of the Arab agitators by giving them offices of state. His most famous protégé is, of course, the Mufti of Jerusalem, who was later to play such a distinguished role in conducting the anti-British and anti-Zionist campaigns in the Middle East.

(2) Anti-Jewish riots broke out in Jaffa in 1921. The immediate reaction of the High Commissioner was to suspend Jewish immigration into the country.

(3) In June 1921, Samuel gave the first interpretation of the Government's policy in Palestine, which was a foretaste of things to come. Speaking of the Balfour Declaration, he said: "It means that the Jews, a people who are scattered throughout the world, but whose hearts are always turned to Palestine, should be entitled to found there their home, and that some among them—within the limits that are fixed

by the interests of the present population—should come to Palestine in order to help by their resources and efforts to develop the country to the advantage of all its inhabitants."

(4) He sold certain State lands in Beisan to the Arabs for next to nothing (land on which the Mandate enjoins the Government to facilitate Jewish colonization). The extraordinary thing about this transaction was that the Arabs subsequently sold some of the land to the Jews at a very nice profit.

(5) He advised the Colonial Office to cut off Transjordan from Palestine and to exclude the Jews from it on the ground that Transjordan came within the MacMahon promises.

He was, above all, the main inspiration and perhaps the real author of the White Paper. In May 1922 he travelled to London, anxious to bring back to Palestine a symbol of satisfaction to the Arabs. He was in communication with the Colonial Office and the Zionist leaders and impressed upon them the magnitude of Arab unrest. Weizmann, usually optimistic, was very depressed and agreed to the whittling down of Jewish aspirations and to the principle of holding a political balance between Jews and Arabs. It was at that time that the "cold genius of Samuel organized the retreat of Zionism.

Even a moderate English Zionist like Colonel Kisch, who understands the English point of view remarkably well, writes with some resentment of Samuel's attitude to the Zionist cause. Colonel Kisch was the head of the Palestine political department of the Zionist organization during a considerable part of Samuel's term of office. In his *Palestine Diary* he says that in all his dealings with Samuel he found the latter critical and unresponsive to Zionist arguments and suggestions. Samuel's first reaction to any Jewish plan was invariably "What will the Arabs say?" Kisch compares this attitude with that of his successor, Lord Plumer, the English soldier, who would approve of any plan which was in accordance with the policy of His Majesty's Government, no matter what the Arabs did or threatened to do. He also describes the mistrust with which the High Commissioner held Jewish

industrialists and his opposition to their schemes of a tariff policy to suit an infant industry. He points out the depressing effect which interviews with the High Commissioner had upon himself. Hearing the views of the Commissioner on Zionist problems was to him like receiving an unpleasant douche of cold water.

Samuel's reply to these strictures is that he is still a Zionist and that concessions were necessary both on the ground of humanity and expediency. He is probably convinced that by his moderation and wisdom he saved the National Home from calamity.

Most Zionists contend, however, that by taking the stand-point that the development of Palestine was conditioned by the interests of the local population, he was destructive of the just aspirations of the Jewish people.

Whatever the final judgment of history, it is clear that Samuel threw his weight in 1922 to curtail the scope of Zionist work, and even today he refuses to take sufficient account of the intensity of Jewish distress, of the just claims of Jewish nationalism, and of the strength of the Jewish will to statehood.

In addition, a vicious campaign against Zionism was gaining momentum in the early '20s. The popular Press in England published articles alleging that Palestine was overrun with Jewish Bolsheviks, that Rutenberg (the man who advised Kerensky to shoot Lenin and Trotsky) was a notorious and dangerous Bolshevik leader and that Zionism was being carried out at the expense of the British taxpayers.

This campaign was to a large extent inspired and directed by the great Press Lords of Britain. Lord Northcliffe visited Palestine at that period and was unfavourably impressed by what he regarded as rude behaviour on the part of the Jewish pioneers towards himself. When he entered the dining-room of one of the newly established communal settlements he expected everyone to rise and greet him. The workers, however, took no notice of him, remained seated and went on eating. Whereupon they were severely reprimanded by His Lordship for lack of manners.

This small incident may or may not account for some of his bitterness against Zionism. In any case, he was prejudiced against it from the outset for the simple reason that it was supported by Lloyd George. On his return to England he made an "impartial" statement saying that both Arabs and Jews were awful liars but that the Arabs "lied outrageously and the Jews artistically".

Lord Rothermere's contribution to the problem is summed up in the sentence quoted from his article in the *Sunday Pictorial*, November 1920 "The Zionists of all the world over are free to build a National Home if they wish but not at our expense."

Lord Beaverbrook stated that it was in the interest of the Jews not to have a National Home, and proved it by saying that he himself had been approached by a deputation of British Jews who had put to him the case against Zionism.

Another typical example of anti-Zionist propaganda comes from the pen of the ultra-Conservative Lord Sydenham. His article was published in *The Nineteenth Century*, and here is a characteristic pearl: "If the Jews succeed in setting up a Jewish Commonwealth under a successor to David and Solomon, with a Sanhedrin and a Soviet system, there will be a great disaster for which Britain will be entirely responsible."

In the early post-war period this sort of stuff found some response. A strong reaction to the mood of war set in and the populace clamoured for a peaceful life with as few commitments abroad as possible. Hence the demand to reduce the military garrisons in Palestine and Iraq or even to evacuate them became vocal.

In the meantime Lloyd George, the staunch friend of Zionism, fell from power and a new king arose in Egypt who knew not Joseph.

The new Government had to take notice of this agitation which went on in the popular Press and among the diehards. The latter scored a victory in June 1922 in a debate in the *House of Lords*, where they defeated the Government on the issue of Zionist policy by carrying their motion denouncing

the Mandate by 60 votes to 20. The debate was remarkable for the speech of Lord Balfour in which he defended Zionism. He went so far as to say: "It may fail I do not deny that this is an adventure; but are we never to have adventures? Are we never to try experiments?"

On the continent the Vatican and France were both uneasy about the developments in Palestine. The fact that Palestine is dotted with Catholic monasteries and schools and the fact that Catholic influence in the country is strong, explains the Vatican's opposition to the extension of Jewish influence in Palestine at that time. France, though officially friendly to the cause of Zionism, had some suspicions about it on account of a post-war jealousy and rivalry between England and France, particularly in the Middle East. The French regarded the Zionists as agents of Britain and as working against French influence in the Eastern Mediterranean. Both the Vatican and France played some part in adding to the difficulties which the Jews faced immediately after the war.

In spite of this impressive array of hostile factors, Zionism could have perhaps maintained its position if it had been inherently stronger. Unfortunately the Jewish position at that period was far from healthy. The Jews, famous throughout the world for wealth, failed to raise the necessary money, and Zionism suffered from a chronic lack of funds. In 1921, Winston Churchill, in his capacity of Colonial Secretary, visited Palestine and discovered that the Zionists were not so strong as he had imagined. The work was done on a small scale; the pioneers, though of a fine type, were in rags and had no boots. They were badly fed and often went without food. Capital was shy and did not stream into Palestine. The impression he received was that Britain had overestimated the strength of Zionism.

A tone of pessimism spread and Jews were asking themselves whether they were bluffing the world. As early as December 1919 Weizmann, during a visit to Palestine, expressed his disappointment.

"The Balfour Declaration was for me a great trumpet,

which should have aroused the masses of our people and created among them a sort of Messianic movement. But what did it create? Apart from the Hebrew Legion in which I saw a particle of all that I hoped to see, there was nothing but barren enthusiasm. Even as regards money not more than half a million pounds came in. Jewry has not yet answered the call. The great vision has not yet come to pass. There has been no stirring of the masses such as we saw in the first voluntary enlistment of Englishmen. . . . I shall be asked if I can see the great vision. My reply is that I see here and there a flash but the flame I do not see . . .”

BETWEEN TWO WARS

Zionism and the British

The story of the world between the two wars is a story of an anti-climax, of great visions fading and high hopes vanishing, of the triumph of selfishness, mediocrity, inertia, and expediency in the affairs of men, and of insufficient exertion, insufficient willpower, and insufficient faith.

British policy in Palestine was bound up with world events. It was a typical chapter in a disappointing book. It is the story of the Balfour Declaration degenerating into the White Paper of 1939.

British policy in Palestine can be compared to climbing. Once a climber reaches a very high altitude, breathing becomes increasingly difficult. Similarly, the greater the achievement of Jews in Palestine the more difficult breathing became for them. In 1917 the Jews could breathe freely; their legal rights were secure but they were at the bottom of the mountain. In 1939 when they had attained a great height, their oxygen became scarcer and the danger of suffocation became real. Jewish achievements rose and rose, but their rights were withdrawn by stages. By 1939 they had almost none left. The oxygen was practically exhausted.

The Balfour Declaration was a great act of justice and humanity. It fulfilled Herzl's prophecy that "England will understand us". England stretched out a hand to the drowning Jewish masses in Europe and helped them to reach dry land. It was a gesture of kindness and vision worthy of the best traditions of the British.

Yet, it was not entirely a wartime creation. Zionism had, for centuries, been dormant in the Anglo-Saxons. The most agreeable surprise for a student of English Zionism is to find out that the movement has for generations been an important force in the consciousness of England. In the British Museum one can find a large number of pamphlets written by Eng-

lish intellectuals advocating the restoration of the Jews to Palestine on political, religious, and humanitarian grounds. In the *History of Zionism*, N. Sokolow describes with a wealth of detail the contributions of these English clergymen, politicians and authors to Zionism. Great events in history are apparently not the result of caprice and blind forces. They must be anticipated and carefully prepared for before they are consummated. English soil took kindly to the ideal of Jewish restoration and Zionism became there a genuine emotion.

Today the Jews have a violent disagreement with the British on their Palestinian policy, yet the Jews still cling to the belief that Britain, which has assisted in the birth of so many nations, will reaffirm its faith in Zionism; for Zionism is as much a child of the British as of the Jews.

The motive behind the Balfour Declaration was not so much strategy, finance or propaganda, though these may have been important considerations, as an idealistic urge to take part in an experiment of world-wide significance. Dr. Weizmann, who should know better than anybody else, told the Twelfth Zionist Congress in 1921: "If you imagine that this coincidence of interests (between Britain and the Jews) is a strategic one, you are building on a false premise. . . . If you were to ask every English imperialist whether Palestine was necessary for their imperialist purposes, you would receive a direct negative. From the strategic, from the military standpoint, Palestine is useless for England, and those who have imagined that we, i.e. the Jewish people, are absolutely necessary for the vital nerve of the British Empire—the Suez Canal—have made a mistake. Perhaps the English strategists do not understand their own interests. That is possible. But I have told you their opinion. If you ask the representatives of the British Navy, the English Army, out of every hundred replies you will get ninety-five which are against the retention of Palestine. So do not flatter yourselves that you are the guardians of the Suez Canal. England has made other arrangements for that purpose."

"There is, however, another coincidence of interests. That is what the English call 'goodwill'—the goodwill of the Jewish people England with her comprehensive farsightedness—perhaps for reasons which I will indicate—understood sooner and better than any other nation that the Jewish question, which hangs like a shadow over the whole world, can become a gigantic force of construction or a mighty instrument of destruction. And England understands—perhaps we have contributed a little to this understanding—that the utilization of Jewish goodwill and the diversion of Jewish constructive forces to Palestine would be of enormous use. And, therefore, it was not English generals, nor the English imperialists, but English intellectuals who primarily gave direction to our policy."

It was Balfour the intellectual who, long before the first world war, conceived the Balfour Declaration and who always had a profound insight into the meaning of Jewish nationalism.

Lord Bertie, a former British Ambassador in France, in his Diary about the end of 1917 refers to Balfour's Zionism. "Paul Cambon paid me a visit this morning. In discussing Palestine he said that Balfour explained his support of Zionism as partly financial and partly political, and also sentimental, viz the necessity to conciliate the American Jews who have gone in for Palestine and who can supply money for loans and his own feeling that it would be an interesting experiment to reconstitute a Jewish kingdom. Cambon reminded him of the prophecy that the King of the Jews would be the end of the world. Balfour thinks that such a dénouement would be still more interesting."

This report does not do justice to the man whose very soul was deeply stirred by the idea of a Jewish State. Harold Nicolson reports in the *Spectator* of May 1939 a conversation which shows the cynical statesman in a more serious vein. "I can recall a conversation of Lord Balfour in which he startled me by a fervour of conviction alien to his temperament. It was this conversation that shows me that for him

Zionism was no wartime gambit, but a course the success of which would by one great act at least do something to mitigate the uselessness of the war. The Jews, he said, are among the most gifted races of mankind. They have many material aptitudes, a wide spiritual foundation but only one idea. That idea is the return to Zion. By depriving them of that idea the world has diminished their virtues and stimulated their defects. If we can help them to attain their ideal, we shall restore to them their dignity. Upon the basis of that dignity their intelligence will cease to be merely acquisitive and become creative."

Lloyd George, speaking to the Jewish Historical Society of England in 1925, dealt with the question of the British attitude to Zionism during the war. He said "Our motives were mixed. It was undoubtedly inspired by natural sympathy and admiration and also by the fact that, as you must remember, we had been trained even more in Hebrew history than in the history of our own country. I was brought up in a school where I was taught far more about the history of the Jews than about the history of our own land. I could tell you all the kings of Israel. But I doubt whether I could have named half a dozen of the kings of England and not more of the kings of Wales." He went on to say that the Balfour Declaration was given not only on the ground of sympathy but also of interest, and concluded the subject by emphasizing the importance of the services rendered to the Allies by Dr. Weizmann. "I felt", he said, "a deep debt of gratitude and so did all the allies to the brilliant scientific genius of Dr. Weizmann. When we talked to him and asked him: 'What can we do for you in the way of any honour?' he said, 'All I care for is an opportunity to do something for my people.' . . . Acetone converted me to Zionism."

Lloyd George has the distinction of having created a new legend in Jewish history, i.e. the Weizmann legend. When we were children at school in Palestine we were taught that Weizmann had won the war and had got Palestine as a reward. We liked this story and it had an Oriental air about it. The

Welsh wizard was the mighty Sultan and Weizmann the wise and brave hero who, having overcome all the obstacles, marries the Sultan's daughter and lives happily ever after. Unfortunately there are many grown-up people—Jews and non-Jews—who take this story literally. By laying too much emphasis on Weizmann and his Acetone they do harm to the dignity of the Jewish national cause. Great historical forces cannot be reduced to a fairy tale, and great events cannot be entirely dependent on the whim of personalities, however powerful and however lovable. It is interesting to note that Dr Weizmann himself is a consistent unbeliever in the Weizmann legend.

Arab Unrest

What are the forces which compelled the British Government to withdraw from the Balfour Declaration? The first factor to be considered is that of the Arab problem.

The main contribution of the Arabs in Palestine to the story of the National Home is a series of riots and disturbances against the Jews and the Government.

There have been three main series of rioting occurring at rough intervals of seven to nine years. (1) The riots of April 1920, in Jerusalem, and the riots of May 1921, in Jaffa. (2) The riots of 1929 arising out of the Wailing Wall incidents. (3) The riots of 1936-39 which began with the Jaffa massacre. The last disturbances were the most serious and protracted, and were complicated by many external factors to which reference will be made in due course. It also secured the highest dividends, i.e. the White Paper of 1939 which relegated the Jews to the status of a minority, made Jewish immigration dependent on the consent of the Arabs, and prohibited or restricted the sale of land to the Jews.

A word or two should be said about the Arab angle of the Palestinian triangle. It must be remembered that costly Arab rioting took place in the Middle East, particularly in Iraq and Syria. The Palestinian disturbances, therefore, cannot be said to be due only or perhaps even primarily to the

Zionist experiment. They are merely symptoms of the general Arab unrest and of the adolescence of Arab nationalism.

Secondly, the attitude of some of the local British officials did tend to encourage Arab rioting, particularly in the early phases of the National Home. Referring to the 1922 riots, for example, the Peel Report says: "One unhappy result of the situation was that some civil servants in Palestine did not, as in the United Kingdom or India, stand aloof from religious faction or political strife but found themselves in some cases forced into the position of partisans to represent the Arab cause."

Moreover, the Arab population, as Lord Samuel points out, is easily susceptible to incitement by unscrupulous agitators. In each of the three major disturbances a different theme was chosen by the agitators to make the Arabs "see red". In 1921 the bogey of the alien, godless, and immoral Bolsheviks was raised; in 1929 the religious fanaticism of the Arabs was excited to a great heat and stories were spread to the effect that the Jews had designs on Moslem places of worship. In 1936-39 the propagandists and agents skilfully played on the fears of the Arabs for their future by exaggerating the ambitions of the Zionists and by falsely accusing them of scheming to exterminate the Arabs.

Every colonization involves a certain amount of conflict with the native population. The surprising thing is not that there have been riots but that they have never been serious enough to stop the life of the Yishuv or undermine it. Arab suspicions and anger would suddenly flare up, but in spite of the oil poured would gradually die down. Arab hostility has never really been desperate and fundamental.

Those days and nights reverberating with unfounded Arab fears and misguided Arab hate appeared to dominate the Palestinian scene, but today the fears and hatred have largely died out. The Palestinian soil drenched with the blood of the two peoples again brings forth blossoms of friendship and goodwill. The Arabs begin to realize that they have everything to gain and nothing to lose by working with the Jews.

The British Administration

The second factor which contributed to the defeat of political Zionism was the British administration in Palestine.

In a static society a British administration is the ideal thing. It always manages to provide a more or less efficient system of law and security and leaves the natives alone. It is generally neither cruel nor oppressive.

In the routine of the administration of Palestine nothing but praise can be given. Few can deny that it brought many improvements to the Palestinian system of education, taxation, law, health, transport, and so on, though "it should be fully recognized that while the social activities of the Government were directly or indirectly beneficial to the country as a whole, they were more to the advantage of the Arabs than to the Jews" (Peel Report).

Yet few can assert that in handling the Zionist experiment the British administration has shown either imagination or firmness of purpose. Lord Wedgwood goes as far as to say that in Palestine he "found the worst British administration in the whole Empire, and the best Jews in the whole world".

In Zionism, the British administration encountered something quite unique and dynamic.

There was a certain element of racial and instinctive dislike, but this factor, I believe, was exaggerated by the sensitive Jews. Anglo-Saxons and Jews manage in ordinary circumstances to get on quite well with each other. In Palestine, however, the Jews and the English worked in extraordinary circumstances. The friction between them was so acute that nine out of ten Jews believed, and still believe, that the English officials created the Arab problem in Palestine, and actually engineered the Arab riots. Having regard to the English mentality and Government it is a mistake, I think, to attribute the responsibility to the collective machine of the British administration in Palestine. Nevertheless, the Jews had good reasons to believe that in certain periods of the history of the National Home a considerable section of the

Administration was in disagreement with the Zionist policy of the central government in London and was an unreliable instrument in the execution of that policy. They had grounds to believe that some officials in a private capacity came into contact with the Arab leaders and agitators and encouraged them to persist in their antagonism to Zionism; and that in the final phase in the history of the Jewish National Home British officials, as "men on the spot", advised the London authorities to appease the Arabs by curtailing the scope of Zionist work.

Perhaps the Jews expected too much from the unimaginative people. After all, why should the British officials put their heart into an experiment the wide repercussions of which they do not apprehend and the merit of which they do not appreciate. The Jews were not English colonists but "foreigners", and why should they take so much trouble to establish an alien race in an alien territory? It would have required a group of supermen to stand above personal prejudice to disregard administrative convenience and to rise above narrow local issues so as to see the problem in its true setting. Unfortunately the British officials were neither gifted men of action like Rhodes nor intellectual giants like Balfour. They were small people who wanted a quiet life.

Their attitude to Zionism went through two interesting phases. At the early stages of the history of the National Home the British officials generally pooh-poohed the Zionist effort, and underestimated it. They regarded it as a fancy idea—a mere whim of some sentimental British statesmen and some influential Jews.

One of them in his *Palestine Notebook*, 1918-23, writes about the old Jews of Jerusalem. "Walking down the street of Jerusalem an American pointed out to the anaemic idle slum population drifting past us, and said to me, 'These people haven't got the proper material for the making of a State.'" About the Jewish pioneers he writes: "I doubt the efficacy of the Russian intelligentsia whom they are now putting on the land here—charming though they are. They talk so wonderfully."

Another Englishman in close touch with the British officials wrote about Rutenberg's scheme for the electrification of Palestine: "The Jordan is to be harnessed at enormous expense and great cables are to bear electric power from below sea-level over pathless and lofty hills, if all goes well. But to what purpose? To light a few houses in four small towns where most of the population goes to bed with the dark, where the moon is the chief illuminant" How reminiscent of the arguments in England against the introduction of railways! The "inevitable failure" of the Rutenberg scheme was predicted.

In 1939, however, the British officials looked upon Zionism as a great menace. They could point out that Palestine had ceased to be a problem of a local nature—a mere fight between Palestinian Arabs and Zionists—but had become a central issue of politics in the Arab-speaking countries; that Arab rebels from these countries had participated in the disturbances and that Arab politicians were seeking to take a hand in the affairs of Palestine. They maintained that the whole Middle East was in a state of unrest; that Zionism was likely to upset the equilibrium of the whole region and affect vital imperial interests. They induced the British Government to accept their view.

But why did Arab politicians display such a lively interest in Palestinian problems? What made the Arab disturbances persist for such a long time? What compelled the mighty British empire to submit to the threats of the immature Arab politicians and frightened British officials? The answer is to be found in the main plot of the world drama, i.e. in the threat of Hitlerism.

The World Crisis

In the years preceding the war, Germany became the dominant power in Europe and in the Mediterranean the rivalry between England and Italy became more and more acute.

Hitler is not only the enemy of the Jews in the Diaspora

but also of the Zionist experiment in Palestine. In *Mein Kampf* he attacks Zionism on the ground that it is not a sincere effort to solve the Jewish problem but only an attempt to create in Palestine a "headquarters for Jewish crooks".

In the early years of the Nazi regime the Zionists still enjoyed certain facilities for work in Germany, and it was said in a joke that only Nazi and Zionist meetings were legal in that country. Later, however, the Nazis looked upon Zionism with disfavour and lent moral and material support to the Arab rebels. Alfred Rosenberg declared that the Jewish masses of Europe, and indeed of the world, should be transferred to Africa and there made to do some "useful work" under Aryan overseers.

The junior partner of the Axis, Mussolini, was at first an anti-Zionist. Later in his career he began to take a sympathetic interest in Zionism, receive Zionist leaders, visited the Palestinian Pavilion in Bari, provided facilities for the training of Zionist sailors in Italy and in his paper, *Popolo d'Italia*, openly advocated the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine. The rapprochement between Germany and Italy brought a sudden change, and the Italians began a violent campaign against the Jewish colonization in Palestine and sought to enlist Arab support for the new "protector of Islam"—the Duce.

German and Italian propaganda, German and Italian money, and German and Italian agents poured into the Middle East and made the troubled waters even more troubled.

If Britain suffered from weariness after the last war it certainly suffered from anaemia and softness before the present war. Appeasement is a very ugly chapter in British history, of which the heroic and virile British of today are thoroughly ashamed. Britain consistently refused to take the plunge and sacrificed honour and justice in the hope of putting off unwelcome tasks. Political Zionism was also one of those causes which were offered to the wolves.

The weakening in the bargaining power of the Jews was another factor in the situation. In the last war both the

Germans and the Allies courted the Jews and the British just managed to anticipate the Germans in offering Palestine to the Jewish people. Those were the days when Ludendorff addressed the Warsaw Jews as "My dear Jews".

After the publication of the 1930 White Paper Lloyd George and General Smuts wrote: "We shall not conciliate the Arabs but we shall alienate an even more powerful race." In 1939 British politicians took Jewish impotence for granted.

On the eve of the second world war the Jews had no alternative but to range themselves against their mortal enemy. To the Allies both before and after the outbreak of war the Jews were a "free gift" and sometimes a very embarrassing gift.

When the Jews protested, shouted, demonstrated, and complained the answer was "so what?" In a world stained with blood and strewn with dead bodies the shouts of the Jews were dismissed as a *nuisance*. People were getting fed up with the eternal "Protestants"

And thus it came to pass that the White Paper of 1939 was added to the long, dreary, but really unimportant list of British policies in Palestine—a list of Royal Commissions, White Papers, Experts' Reports, schemes of legislative councils and an Arab Agency, Partition, etc., etc.—a list of trials which have proved errors and of "omissions and commissions."

Perhaps there is some sense in them, perhaps there is some logic in this famous method of "muddling through" or going by "horse sense". And though I clearly see the enormous difficulties which confronted the British in Palestine in the execution of the Zionist policy, I believe that the failure was basically due to lack of imagination and will power on the part of the British and the mistaken application of colonial methods to the gigantic task of reconstruction involving a modern, highly educated, and energetic people.

Two Leaders

Within the Zionist ranks two schools of thought arose: one which supported Weizmann's policy and the other which

followed Jabotinsky's lead. The issues between them dominated Zionist politics between 1922 and the present day.

British vacillations had a direct effect on the Zionist leadership, which was largely dependent on the goodwill of the British Government. Whenever Zionism passed through a severe crisis, whenever Zionism seemed to founder on the rocks of reality, the leaders would become subject to a feeling of inferiority and would become enormously sensitive to external pressure. Once in this mood they were prepared to argue that if a Jewish State was impossible of attainment it was wise to accept something less. In 1924, for example, Weizmann said in Canada, "It is ridiculous to talk of an exclusively Jewish Palestine. Palestine must be built on the basis of autonomy for all peoples composing the population as is the case in Switzerland." A short time later he said to a gathering of Jewish notables in New York, "We do not wish any privileged position in Palestine and will stand or fall by what the Jews do or do not do. I want to see a land in which Jews do not dominate non-Jews and non-Jews do not dominate Jews." Before the opening of the Seventeenth Zionist Congress in 1931 Weizmann declared in an interview: "I strongly feel that agreement with the Arabs is obtainable on the basis of parity. . . . I have no sympathy or understanding for the demand for a Jewish majority. A majority does not necessarily guarantee security. We may have a majority and still be insecure. A majority is not required for the development of a Jewish civilization and culture. The world will construe the demand only in one sense, that we want to acquire a majority in order to drive out the Arabs. Why should we raise the demand which can only make a provocative impression?"

In the last two decades or so Weizmann has changed his view on Zionist aims and policy a number of times. First, after the Balfour Declaration he believed that Palestine would become as Jewish as England is English. (2) After the White Paper of 1922 he accepted Samuel's idea of an Arab-Jewish State. (3) Bi-nationalism lasted until the Peel Commission

made the report. He then became an ardent advocate of a Jewish State in a partitioned Palestine. (4) After 1939, when the plan of Partition had been shelved, he reverted to the slogan of "non-domination". (5) Recently he stated that Palestine should become a Jewish Commonwealth and should absorb millions of Jews from Europe.

That weighty arguments to justify these political somersaults can be put forward by Zionist leadership is certain, but there is nevertheless no doubt that these somersaults had injurious effects on the internal health of Zionism.

One important result was the rise of Revisionism. Revisionism was to a large extent a movement of revolt against the emasculation of Zionism which Weizmann had to accept as a result of the pressure of the British Government and a re-assertion of the Jewish will to nationhood. Jabotinsky was the Jewish Garibaldi who rose against the Jewish Cavour.

During the last war he played a leading part in the creation of the Jewish legion and after the war he became prominent in the organization of Jewish self-defence units in Jerusalem. These two events and the subsequent imprisonment of Jabotinsky by the British authorities are not merely isolated incidents in his life but bear an organic relation to the rise of the Revisionist movement. It can even be said that the movement was conceived in the Jordan Valley where Jewish troops marched and born in the Jewish suburbs of Jerusalem where Jews learned to vindicate their honour by defending themselves against attack by brute force. It was not so much his intellectual brilliance as the part he took in those events that later served as his credentials to the Jewish youth in Europe and Palestine. He could never have inspired Jewish youth if he had not fought in person with the Legionaries and if he had not defied the anti-Zionist administration of Palestine.

After his release from prison he became a member of the Zionist executive and took part in the organizing of the financial campaigns of the Keren Hayesod. Some time after the publication of the White Paper of 1939 difference of opinion

between him and Dr. Weizmann became evident. In January 1923 he tendered his resignation.

In an interview with the Berlin correspondent of the Jewish *Morning Post* he explained the motives which led him to this step: "I resigned from the Zionist executive and organization because I came to the conclusion that I could no longer remain a mere critic of our present Zionist policy. I had to become a rebel."

In 1923 a tour of lectures in European capitals was conducted in which Jabotinsky stated his views, and in 1924 he and his adherents held a conference in Leipzig and issued a manifesto which called attention to the loss of prestige of the Zionist movement and attributed it to its "limitless elasticity and supine passivity". The manifesto maintained that the Jewish masses had no enthusiasm for an emasculated movement, for a counterfeit of Zionism devoid of its two main attributes, that of a great free immigration and that of a great political idea. It demanded the opening up of Palestine and Transjordan for mass immigration and colonization, a thorough reform of the legislative, administrative, and military conditions of Palestine so as to open and prepare the country for mass colonization of Jews on both sides of the Jordan. The manifesto insisted that the duty of maintaining order in Palestine should devolve on the Jews themselves and that Jewish youth, both in the country and in the Diaspora, should be trained for the Palestine Military Garrison. In 1925 Jabotinsky founded the Revisionist movement.

To those who accused him of extremism and lack of realism he said: "Preachers of moderation whom I highly respect and whose wisdom I should be glad to follow only if it were of any use, may say that true as this interpretation of Zionist aims may be (i.e. a Jewish State) it is preferable not to proclaim it aloud. . . . The question of the ultimate aims of Zionism is quite of a different order. First, every attempt to hide the truth is perfectly useless. It takes two to make a silence; not only yourself but also your partner and your partner in this case is the Arab. He has always refused to be

comforted by any diluted or sterilized version of Zionism, either our own or any edited by the Government. Not only because by now his leaders have sufficiently informed him of what they have read in Herzl's book, in Sir Herbert Samuel's pre-Mount of Olives speeches, and in the Bible; but especially because every human being, if not a fool, which the Arab is not, knows by instinct that colonizations 'can only have one meaning and one purpose'. . . Yes, but how can we force the Government to change its attitude? I believe that you have first of all to try and persuade it. If you fail in this, you will reconsider the situation and perhaps revise with a critical eye that pusillanimous superstition popular among some Jews (no Gentiles share it) which says that we are, oh such a weak people, utterly defenceless, condemned, poor wretches, to bear any blow and deprived of all means of effective resistance.

"The first step is a frank statement of our real objects, and the way in which we interpret the mandate's obligations. Before you protest against a Government for refusing to carry out your demands, satisfy yourself as to whether your demands have ever been authoritatively presented. They never have. On the contrary, it is a general and genuine illusion spread today in official circles, British and foreign, that the Zionists are perfectly contented, that they have themselves removed the Herzlian dream."

While in the earliest career of Revisionism his ideas were concentrated on the (1) demand for a Jewish State to include Transjordan; (2) a Jewish Army to defend Palestine; (3) a "colonizatory regime" to facilitate the upbuilding of a Jewish State; (4) opposition to class war, in more recent years two additional ideas were elaborated by him, namely a policy of mass migration or evacuation of Jews from the distressed areas of Europe and the institution of democratic elections with universal suffrage in place of the elections to the Zionist Congress based on the payment of a shekel.

Though some of the activities of the Revisionists, both in

Palestine and Poland, have been strongly criticized, both on the ground that they are contrary to Jewish ethics and on the ground that they impair Zionist unity (the Revisionists seceded from the Zionist Organization in 1935 and founded the New Zionist Organization), an objective observer cannot help feeling that Jabotinsky's significance as an educational force among the Jewish masses cannot be overestimated. He caught the imagination of the Jewish youth in a way that the astute Zionist leaders could never hope to rival. He trained his followers and also outsiders to see the larger issues of the Jewish position in the world. The pressure of his ideas could be felt everywhere and particularly among the Zionists who were loyal to Weizmann's policy. Few meetings passed in the Zionist world without questions and interruptions from Revisionist sympathizers. The Zionist leaders were always on the defensive and were left with little doubt as to where the aspirations of the Jews lay.

Jabotinsky, however, stirred the Jewish masses but was unable to capture them. In fact, his movement was never an organization but a sentiment. It counted too many sympathizers and too few workers.

He would wander in the towns and cities of the Diaspora and explain his teachings. His oratory and sincerity would be the cause of great admiration and excitement but no solid backing followed.

He would often complain that the *Stimmung* of the Jewish masses was for him though their *Einstimmung* was against him. They would listen to him and vote against him, saying that he was a brilliant but dangerous dreamer.

That this should happen is a matter which can only be explained by social psychology. Perhaps his programme was too simple and straightforward, or was it that the Jews were suspicious of anything which was too logical and too straightforward?

He certainly lacked the subtlety of the other Zionist leaders and the "ability to work with Jews". They said that he had a *goisher kop*—a fact, however, which greatly endeared

him to Gentiles, who admired his personality and his frank statement of policy.

In the last years of his life he lost his old vigour and even his mastery over an audience, which in earlier times had been unchallenged, began to weaken. The attention of the audience would sometimes wander, though at other times he would rise again to great heights with the same old fire and faith but only to descend rapidly to the bitter reality of weariness and unfulfilled destiny.

Those close to him say that shortly before his death he had a presentiment of a premature and sudden death. It is significant that years before his death he portrayed in his novel *Samson* the tragedy of a Jewish hero. His was also the story of a tragic giant who was little understood by his people. He lived and died in a political wilderness.

The Jews are a nation that devours its leaders. One life span is not sufficient to master this gifted but obstinate race. Like the proverbial widow, they bury their leaders one after another.

Whatever the future of the movement he created, it is certain that his stature will grow as the years go by and that his name will be remembered—so long as Israel is a nation.

Some people today still think in terms of the controversy of Weizmann versus Jabotinsky. To me this is like raising issues of the Wars of the Roses in modern England. Both Weizmann and Jabotinsky had to fulfil essential functions, and it is unfortunate that they had to work in an atmosphere of bitterness and hostility. Weizmann had to deal with facts. He measured the strength of the Jewish position and based his policy on that strength. His was scientific genius applied to politics. An impartial observer must admit that Weizmann had very poor cards and that nevertheless he played with skill—avoiding big stakes, postponing final decisions and prolonging the game as much as possible.

Jabotinsky, on the other hand, was a man who was interested not in the actual but in the potential. He prepared the Jews for things to come, he anticipated events, he taught and

brought up a new generation. He was a prophet and his policy was a long-term policy. Both of them were valuable forces in the Zionist phase under discussion, and only small minds fail to see now the enormous contribution which each of them in his own way brought to the cause of the Jewish struggle for survival and dignity.

Balance Sheet

While the account of the Jewish rights in Palestine during the period of the Jewish National Home is one of "diminishing returns" that of their achievements is one of "increasing returns".

After two decades of work under the British, the Zionists can produce the following balance sheet. The population of Jewish Palestine is about half a million or about a third of the general population. The Zionists have acquired roughly a million and a half metric dunams or about 7 per cent of the total land in Palestine. By the end of 1930 there were about 250 settlements inhabited by 128,000 persons. The number actually engaged in agriculture was of course much smaller. About 6·4 per cent of the Yishuv, Jewish investments in Palestine were about £100,000,000, of which £60,000,000 were national capital. The national income of the Jewish population in 1936 was ££18·5 million or £46 per head. In 1931 it was the same figure but the national income per head was £38.

The Jews, famous throughout the world as town-dwellers, are the great town builders of Palestine. The New York of Palestine is Tel-Aviv with a population rapidly approaching 200,000. The Jews are also responsible for the rapid development of Jerusalem, Haifa, and lesser towns. In the towns and even in villages the Jews have built up industries which are slowly but surely gaining ascendancy all over the Middle East. The industrial development of Palestine has been greatly accelerated by the orders from the Army in the Middle East, and by the opening of new markets which hitherto had been dependent on European supplies.

Palestine has also become an important commercial centre for the Middle East, for already seven years ago the saying went round the tents of Arabia that one could buy anything one wanted—big or small—in the shops of Tel-Aviv. The Yishuv can boast of a wealth of economic institutions including an extraordinary number of banks and a comprehensive and highly developed system of co-operatives.

In self-government the Jews have made a great advance on the period before the first war. They now have a central body in addition to the local councils. The central body is responsible for Jewish education, for religious organization (through the religious authorities), and for social welfare. In recent years the Jews have also made experiments in voluntary taxation to meet the extraordinary problems which have arisen as a result of the disturbances and the war.

The success of all these institutions has been incomplete. It is largely due to the fact that the powers which they possess are limited or entirely of a voluntary character. Nevertheless in them and in the work of the Jewish municipalities, and in the co-operative enterprises of the *Histadrut* and other Jewish institutions, it is possible to discern signs of promise for the future. The Jews are learning the art of self-government in difficult conditions and are not likely to fail when real responsibility and real power come their way.

In the sphere of education Zionists can point out a nationwide system ranging from the kindergartens to the Hebrew University and one which includes a number of teachers' colleges, agricultural schools, the Daniel Sieff Institute for Agricultural Chemistry and the Technical Institute at Haifa. The cultural life of Palestine is outstanding in its intensity. There is a lively interest in music, art, the theatre and the country has become during this period the unchallenged centre of Hebrew literature and the Hebrew Press.

Against the background of Palestine the record of achievement of the Yishuv appears impressive, but it does not appear to be so against the background of the Jewish Diaspora. Zionists who have sought to make Palestine the real home of the

Jews, who have thought in terms of millions of people and who have talked about the liquidation of the Jewish distress in Europe, have had to face the disappointments of daily work and the slow rhythm of progress. After so many years of work Jewish land area is less than that of a small English county, and the Jewish population in Palestine is less than that of the Jewish population of Warsaw and Moscow taken together. They have had to haggle with an indifferent Palestinian administration about hundreds of certificates of immigration and petty restrictions, and they have had to work with resources inferior to those possessed by a provincial big city in England. The stars had promised them much more than they actually obtained.

On second thoughts, however, the record does not look so disappointing. The Jews have had to work in a territory with a hostile native population, an unfriendly administration, with an army of intellectuals and shopkeepers, and with no money and no machinery of government. Could another nation achieve more under the same circumstances? Are not the Jewish pioneers remarkable types of men of whom any nation could be proud? Have the Jews not "conquered" labour, the Palestinian earth and the Palestinian sea? Have the Jews not performed a miracle by the creation of a youth which is ready for sacrifice for the salvation of the whole nation and of man?

The process of Jewish rebirth has been extremely painful and extremely complicated. The setbacks have been many and the disappointments numberless. Yet these setbacks and disappointments steeled the character of the new builders and strengthened their spirit of resistance. They emerged better men and better fighters from these ordeals.

It is sometimes dangerous to have sudden successes and brilliant victories. There is an inexorable law of growth in life. If the Jews had attained everything they wanted easily and quickly, if they had received Palestine as a gift, and if they had relied on the exertions of others and not on themselves, they would probably have found themselves in a

sorry state today. They would probably have not a National Home ripe for the transition to a Jewish Commonwealth but a national cemetery in Palestine, and of Jewish colonization nothing would have remained but a heap of ruins—a warning and byword to all nations.

BACK TO THE JEWISH STATE

WHEN Herzl wrote *The Jewish State* he assumed that the Jews were ripe and ready for statehood. He concentrated all his attention on convincing the Jews of the need for a State and on presenting his case to the European rulers. This task, which taxed his spiritual and physical resources, was of tremendous importance. He did not, however, fully appreciate that to attain statehood the Jews had to run the gauntlet of a bitter and difficult struggle.

After 1922 the phrase "a Jewish State" was taboo both among English politicians and Zionist leaders. It was a thing one could hope for and pray for but not discuss. When in 1931, for example, a radical Zionist attacked Weizmann's policy on the ground that it was contrary to Herzl's teachings, the latter replied: "Do you intend to raise Herzl from the grave in order to fight me?"

In 1937 the idea of a Jewish State was revived by the Peel Commission. The Partition scheme was a caricature of Herzl's Jewish State—a dwarf and an abortion. Yet in spite of all superficial appearances to the contrary the glee and satisfaction with which the scheme was welcomed by many of the Zionist leaders was unmistakable. Here was the first recognition of the claims of the Jews to statehood by an official body of a great nation. Secondly, Zionism reached a brick wall in its work of colonization. Its resources were inadequate to undertake colonization on a truly big scale. Charitable and philanthropic subscriptions could not be a substitute for a national treasury, a system of self-taxation and power to negotiate loans. Zionists were tired of the endless appeals for money, and Weizmann declared that he was finished with playing the role of the "King of Schnorrers".

Fears were also expressed that the money sunk by Jews in Palestine tended to find its way to the pockets of the Arabs, and that instead of a Jewish National Home an Arab National

Home was being created at the expense of the Jews. It was argued that the National Home could not hope to develop or even survive without having complete sovereignty over its affairs and complete control over immigration.

Perhaps the strangest motive in the Jewish enthusiasm for a State was an instinctive one. The idea of a national State fired the imagination of the Jewish masses. Deep in their hearts the Jews knew that a state was the thing they really wanted. They would be masters in their own home; they would have complete freedom to do what they liked; they would undertake great schemes of reconstruction and would be backed by their own government. The Zionist leaders grasped this longing for independence and self-help and were prepared to consider even a mutilated and tiny State. As it turned out, the Partition Scheme proved to be an error of judgment, not so much because of its inherent defects, and these were considerable, but because it did not take into account the darkening of the international horizon. To launch a weak infant state at a time of danger to all states, big and small, was asking for trouble. It would probably have diverted to itself all the unrest of the Middle East and the hostility and spite of the European gangsters, and would probably not have survived the present upheaval.

The Peel report, however, is a great landmark in the story of the Jewish struggle for a home. It was the first British official document which openly talked of a Jewish State and it has shown how deep and strong was the Jewish will to nationhood. It was one of those portents which herald things to come. It was one of the failures which indicate ultimate success.

The idea of a Jewish State means two things. In the first place "Jewish" implies Jewish sovereignty and the rejection of a bi-national state.

Nationalism is the personality of a people. Once you have a bi-national state you get a hybrid state, a split personality in which the urge of nationalism does not find complete fulfilment, and which cuts across the very foundations of the conception of nationalism.

It is true that there are countries in existence in which two or more nationalities manage to live within the same borders, Switzerland is the best example. It should be remembered, however, that the component elements of Switzerland have already found expression in Germany, France, and Italy, and the consequent loss to mankind is therefore not important. Similarly the French in Canada and the Boers in South Africa are largely branches of France and Holland. Hybrid states may become realities and may even survive the friction and impotence inherent in them, yet they are always in the form of additional daughter colonies in the mother country. Most nations have experienced full nationhood, some have in addition experimented in the creation of hybrid states. Are the Jews such an insignificant race that they do not deserve to experience genuine nationhood? We often like to underestimate ourselves but our Gentile friends (and more so our enemies) say that our contribution to the world has been out of all proportion to our numbers. Winston Churchill once wrote: "The Jews are beyond doubt the most formidable and the most remarkable race which has ever appeared in the world." Lloyd George, addressing a Jewish audience, told them: "You belong to a very great race which has made the deepest impression on the destinies of humanity." If this is even partly true the Jews deserve to be at least masters of the affairs of their own home.

An Arab-Jewish State, moreover, is difficult to create because it is up against the factor of time. Switzerland came into existence in the thirteenth century and at that time and for a few centuries afterwards nationalism was of little or no importance. Today nationalism is the strongest force in the world, and we have no centuries to experiment but only a few years. In Palestine time will not heal the wounds of conflict but will condemn a state based on illusions and fallacies to bleed to death.

Such a monstrous state will be short-lived. It will crumble to dust by the sheer weight of its contradiction. Imagine a police force half Jewish and half Arab; one half co-operating

in pogroms and the other half trying to prevent them. Imagine an Arab-Jewish Army impotent because of racial jealousy and antagonism. Imagine a Jerusalem Municipality on a large scale, then you will realize why such a state would be subject to continuous fits of paralysis and ultimately to complete collapse and death.

Those who reckon with Arab-Jewish solidarity in a future bi-national state lose sight of the large Arab problem in the Middle East. Any momentary harmony which might be established would soon be disturbed by the ceaseless waves of the surrounding Arab sea. Unrest would be fomented by agitation and lies, and the very structure of the state will be undermined. The Jews will have to face intrigues outside the frontiers and intrigues within the frontiers. The powers of resistance of a bi-national state will be weak because key positions in the country will be occupied by a "fifth column". The combination of external pressure and inner impotence will be so overwhelming that its doom will be sealed. This is no reflection on the Arabs, some of whom are real patriots and have the interest of their people at heart. Real understanding between Arabs and Jews can only come about when the two parties are placed in a position of equality, i.e. when both Jews and Arabs have independent states of their own. It will be the hard task of Zionism to attain that equality with the Arabs and at the same time to woo them with all sincerity.

"Statehood" implies full control and sovereignty over the affairs of the country. One constantly comes across Jews and even good Zionists who prefer to see a post-war Palestine governed by British officials. They are haunted by the fear that the Jews would prove unequal to the task and would make a mess of things. It has been said that Jews can rule Gentiles and Gentiles can rule Jews, but can Jews rule Jews? This witty remark, like most witty remarks, is only partly true. It does not take into account what is best and most noble in the Jew. It betrays a lack of faith in a people who for three thousand years succeeded without a machinery of

government in preserving laws and customs, and in displaying remarkable powers of self-discipline and cohesion. The modern Jew is not such a creature of anarchy and egoism as we sometimes like to describe him, and he possesses hidden resources of idealism, self-sacrifice, and loyalty. I believe that he will rise to the occasion.

In any case, the best method of learning to walk is by walking, and if the Jews make many mistakes they will know that other nations have made similar mistakes. Even a great nation like France mismanaged its affairs before the present war, to say nothing of a country like Iraq, which has surpassed many South American Republics in its record of *coups d'état*, military revolts, assassinations and dictatorship.

The case against a colonial government for the Jews was well put by the Peel Commission itself "The National Home is a highly educated, highly democratic, very politically minded, and unusually young community. It is conceivable, though we think improbable, that it would acquiesce in a dictatorship if the dictator were a Jew of its own choice; but it can never be at ease under an alien bureaucracy. Crown Colony government is not a suitable form of government for a numerous, self-reliant, progressive people, European for the most part in outlook and equipment, if not in race. The European communities in the British Empire overseas have long outgrown it. The evolution of self-government in India left that stage behind in 1909. Crown Colony government is nowadays mainly maintained for the wardship of politically backward races in the tropical or sub-tropical world."

To a revolutionary and dynamic enterprise like Zionism nothing can be more harmful than a colonial administration which pursues a policy of stagnation and reaction. Zionism and a rigid and reactionary bureaucracy have not worked well together in the past and will surely be even more incompatible in the future. "British officials", says an American writer, "could rule for centuries (in the colonies) without introducing perceptible changes. Nothing irks them so much as new activity; their one ambition is to enjoy the sweet

fruits of their well-paid offices and do as little as possible that might disturb the existing social framework."

The idea of an Arab Federation to include a self-governing Jewish Palestine also vitiates Jewish statehood if carried to its logical conclusion. Federation implies a division of powers between the central federal government and the constituent states. How British publicists and politicians who have taken up the idea propose to allocate these powers is not yet clear, as the whole matter has been discussed only in general and vague terms.

Sir John Marriott, in the *Quarterly Review* of July 1941, writes an article on problems of federalism. He begins by saying "that of all forms of government federalism is admittedly the most difficult", and having discussed the various federal states, he lays down conditions which are essential for a successful federal government. He points out that units should be roughly equal in size, population and wealth. There can be no greater disparity in all these conditions than between the Yishuv and the surrounding Arab countries.

In wealth, the Yishuv is perhaps superior relatively speaking to the neighbouring Arab countries. It possesses a modern industry, agriculture, commerce. In size, on the other hand, Palestine fades into insignificance against the Arab background. In Canada, it should be noted, the French province of Quebec is larger than France and Germany put together. In an Arab Federation the Yishuv would be a drop in an Arab sea.

"Federal constitution", says Sir John, "must be written and rigid", but what Zionism needs above all is flexibility of government. A tremendous task of transporting millions of men and providing them with food, shelter, and work does not brook interference from a central government or bickering and argument about powers and legal rights.

Sir John Marriott does not hide the fact that in the past relations between the states and the federal government have often been strained. Thus in June 1934 the Parliament of Western Australia went so far as to pass a resolution in favour

of secession from the Commonwealth. In Canada there has been a series of disputes between the Dominion government and the provincial governments (the dispute on the Social Credit policy of Alberta, the dispute about the cost of relief to the unemployed, etc.), which have been so serious that a Royal Commission had to be appointed to report on the situation.

If friction was so prevalent between governments of peoples who are of the same stock and outlook, how much more difficult would relations be between two groups who, in the course of history, have developed along divergent lines and are today poles apart?

The tendency of the central government to gain in importance with the passing of time and to triumph over centrifugal forces, is another factor. Can Jews allow themselves to come more and more under the control of an Arab central government and be submerged in an Arab sea before they reach full development?

Sir John emphasizes that "the units anxious or willing to cohere must, while repudiating the idea of unity, desire union". It is obvious that the Jews cannot desire at this early stage of their growth to define rigidly their relationship with their neighbours.

The history of Switzerland and the United States shows that at first the relationship of the various units was that of an association of sovereign states. Switzerland started with a mere defensive league of cantons, while the confederation of the American colonies was at first "little more than a league of friendship between a number of states proclaiming themselves to be sovereign and extremely tenacious of their independence."

If the scheme of Arab-Jewish Federation envisages close association for economic and political collaboration of sovereign states, then it will be a welcome step which may later grow, if circumstances favour it, into a closer union.

One last word. Some of our "advanced" thinkers say that the small state and the conception of national sovereignty

are out-of-date phenomena. The onrush of Hitlerism, it is true, has threatened the small nations, but it has also threatened big nations like France and the Soviet Union. It is the hope of all of us that the new world order will ensure both to small and large nations the right to lead their own lives. This is borne out by the recent utterances of the Anglo-Saxon leaders.

It is also clear from these utterances that sovereignty, although it may be limited with regard to offensive armaments, international trade, international migration and foreign policy, will largely remain untouched. National life will go on as before and men will be free to construct within their own borders any society they desire. The future Jewish State should be accorded the same rights of autonomy as all other states.

A NEW CIVILIZATION

Unity

The question of Jewish unity has become one of the most prominent issues of Jewish life in recent times. The Jew has had to do some hard thinking and has been under the influence of some facts and events which he has been unable to ignore.

First there is the example of England. As early as 1900 Lord Rosebery complained of the "terrible waste" involved in the party system, "for, by the balance of our constitution, while one half of our capable statesmen is in full work, the other half is, by that fact, standing idle in the market place with no one to hire them." About forty years afterwards, in a supreme crisis in history, England realized the truth of such words and under the leadership of Churchill threw party politics overboard, ostensibly for the duration of the war, but perhaps for good. The story of the rebirth of England, following the collapse of France, could not fail to make a great impression on Zionists.

Secondly, the Jews are haunted by historical memories. At a time of great danger about two thousand years ago, when the Romans were threatening to extinguish Jewish national life, Jewish factions were engaged in mutual slaughter and destruction of property. Josephus describes this war within a war as follows: "This new development might be not inaccurately described as a faction bred within a faction, which, like some ravaging beast for lack of other food at length preyed upon its own flesh." These events can explain the Talmudic assertion that the Second Temple was destroyed by futile hatred.

Thirdly, the Jews have been very perplexed by their inability to present a united front in their negotiations and dealings with foreign Governments and international bodies. The rival Jewish organizations have brought needless con-

susion to the Gentiles and loss of dignity to the Jewish people. The Evian Conference is a typical example. A few years ago President Roosevelt invited representatives of about thirty countries to attend the Evian Conference on refugees. It was a most unfortunate event from the point of view of the Jewish people. Third-rate or fourth-rate diplomats were sent by various Governments just to humour the President of a great Republic. It was unfortunate not only because it was regarded by Governments as a matter of little importance—as a mere whim of the President—but also because too many Jewish delegations attended, each presenting a special memorandum and each contributing to the demoralization of the conference.

The problem of Jewish unity in the Diaspora, however, is an extremely difficult one by reason of the dispersion of the Jews, lack of a strong central authority and the strength of the centrifugal forces. In Palestine, where the Jewish population is compact and where the Jews are rapidly developing self-governing institutions, there are greater hopes for Jewish unity. Although Jewish unity in the Diaspora is of great urgency because of the coming peace conference, Jewish unity in Palestine is in the long run of greater importance. Jewish reconstruction after the war cannot be achieved without unity of purpose and cohesion in Palestine.

The internal condition of the Yishuv at the present moment, however, is not entirely satisfactory; there is a division between the Orthodox and un-Orthodox Jews which unfortunately extends to politics, education, and social life; the most extreme Orthodox party, the Agudah, went so far as to create separate institutions and in certain periods of the history of the Yishuv actively fought against the aspirations of political Zionism. The fusion of immigrants from various lands of the Diaspora is not yet complete. Polish Jews, Yemenite Jews, German, and Austrian Jews, etc., all keep separate organizations and all have grievances and complaints. In the "foreign policy" of Zionism a bitter conflict has been waged between the followers of Weizmann and

Jabotinsky. But the most ridiculous phenomenon is the multiplicity of parties. You have the Revisionists, the State Party, General Zionists A, General Zionists B, the Mizrachi, the Labour Party, Poale Zion, and Hashomer Hazair (the last two are, incidentally, the Marxist fringe of the Histadrut); and the Jewish system of education, moreover, is divided into three separate sections: General schools, Mizrachi schools, and Histadrut schools.

The life of the Jews in Palestine is dominated, however, by the division between the "Left" (Histadrut) and the "Citizens". The Left is the most influential Jewish section in Palestine. "The life of our nation in the last generation", says Rutenberg, "has driven our youth to Left-wing politics. Sons and daughters of bankers and great lawyers left the comforts of their homes and went to Palestine to work as labourers. They put at the disposal of the Labour movement energy and self-sacrifice. Hence the rise of the Histadrut and hence the profound difference between the social structure of the Jewish people in dispersion and in Palestine." The "Citizens" complain that the Histadrut has had the lion's share in the benefits and resources of Zionism and that up to the present time Jewry in Palestine "has been standing on one leg only". They stress the need for the creation of the "other leg", i.e. the "Citizens' union". The Left retorts that the citizens pursue a purely negative policy, that they ignore the problems of Zionism as a whole and that they seek to undermine the authority of the leadership of the Zionist movement and of the Yishuv and that they advocate the extinction of the Socialist, national, and democratic principles of Zionism.

The Labour movement in Palestine has undoubtedly made a decisive and considerable contribution to the development of the country. The very fact that a working-class movement did arise in a nation of petty merchants and intellectuals is no mean achievement. The Jewish people will always cherish the memory of the Russian Jewish idealists who early in the present century preached and practised love of labour and love for the soil, and who built up the institutions which made

the survival of the Jewish worker under unpromising conditions possible. Its growth in the last twenty years is also significant. The Histadrut, founded just over twenty years ago by 4,433 workers, can today claim a membership of almost 130,000.

The movement cannot be described as a trade union nor as a political party, though it performs the functions of trade unions and is composed of various political parties, of which the Labour Party is the most important. It is rather a State within a State; it is the "Kingdom of the Histadrut".

One of its chief features is the network of co-operative institutions which have penetrated into every sphere of economic life in the country and which include co-operative agricultural settlements, co-operative stores, co-operatives for marketing dairy produce, financial institutions, transport companies, building societies, etc.

The Histadrut is the most influential factor in the central governing bodies of the Jews in Palestine and in the Jewish Agency for Palestine, though it has not succeeded in capturing the local municipalities. It has produced able and energetic leaders and a trained and disciplined rank and file; it has produced a passionate orator like Ben-Gurion, an able thinker and administrator like Berl Katznelson, and a conscientious executive and likeable personality like Moshe Shertok.

The attainments of the Labour movement in Palestine in colonization, mutual help, and co-operative enterprises have been unparalleled in history. No other Labour movement in the world has done so much constructive work with such meagre resources and under such difficult conditions. No other Labour leaders have worked so hard with so little thought of self, personal comfort, and convenience. Day and night they have been at their job, retiring only after they are completely exhausted. They have had faith in the importance of their work: for they hold that just as Zionism is the Jewish State on the way so is the Labour movement in Palestine the Socialist State on the way.

Yet the Labour movement has not been able to achieve complete understanding with the other half of the Jewish population in Palestine. This is largely due to the political backwardness of the middle class, but also to certain doctrinaire elements within the Labour movement itself and to some of its shortsighted officials. On the whole, however, the leaders clearly see the dangers of separatism and will no doubt play an important part in the attainment of national unity.

The clamour for unity in the last two years has become louder and louder. The international crisis and internal difficulties have both pressed the Yishuv to forget differences and to work in harmony.

Two attempts have been made to bring about Jewish unity in Palestine. In 1940, P. Rutenberg, then head of the Vaad Leum,¹⁰ appealed to all sections of the Yishuv to form a non-party administration. It was mainly directed at the Histadrut. "I have criticisms to direct against the Revisionists, the farmers, General Zionists, but above all against the Histadrut. I contributed to its rise and therefore I can say that it received more than anybody else, that it was regarded as the last hope of the Jewish people and therefore ought to give the Jewish people something in return. Its responsibility is greater because without it the Yishuv can do nothing, just as without the rest of the Yishuv the Histadrut can do nothing. There must be one trade union for all Jewish workers of Palestine, and the trade union must be non-political. Strikes should be forbidden for the duration of the war and local councils should be established under the direction of the Vaad Leumi to enforce compulsory arbitration without the right of appeal. Teachers should also be forbidden to strike; health institutions should be unified and co-ordinated; self-defence organizations must be put on a national, not a party basis; assistance to the unemployed must be distributed according to need and not according to political convictions."

In 1941, after returning from a visit abroad, David Ben-Gurion addressed many meetings in all parts of Palestine,

met representatives of numerous groups and organizations, and with great sincerity and passion told them of the transformation which had occurred in England in 1940 and of the amazing strength which that country discovered in unity. He urged them to follow the great example.

Both attempts, however, failed, though some encouragement can be derived from the fact that they were made. The question of Jewish unity is certainly becoming the central issue in the politics of the Yishuv.

Unity, however, to be effective, must be organic and inspired by common purpose and common ideas. The creation of a façade of unity where quarrels and antagonism take place behind the scenes merely transforms an external disease into an internal one. The attainment of real unity is a hard job and may take a whole generation to accomplish.

On what basis can unity be achieved having regard to the Palestinian reality? The experience of other nations has shown that there are, in the main, three methods of attaining it. First, the Communist method of class-war, secondly the Fascist method of terrorism and dictatorship, thirdly the Anglo-Saxon method based on the ideals of team-work, government by negotiation and government by law.

The Communist method is open to grave criticism both on the ground of its theory and of its practice. Karl Marx's famous sentence in the Communist manifesto that "the history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles" has been repudiated even by ardent Socialists. European history, from the Crusades until the present world struggle, furnishes plenty of examples which prove that the statement is false. Croce commented on it by saying that "history is class war only when it is class war".

The Jewish labour leaders of Palestine have suffered a great deal from the association with such an ideology. Although the more realistic of them reject Marxian class war and are of the opinion that it is pernicious and suicidal to the Jewish people and contrary to the Jewish moral code, they have not been able to prevent the growth of bitterness in Palestine.

between the two classes, and have been unable to secure the happy collaboration of all the elements of the community. It has been one of the causes leading to the present deadlock in the Yishuv.

The Communist method of class war is, above all, costly and destructive. Russia has had to pay very dearly for it in civil wars, trade standstill, famine, the liquidation of the Kulaks (the most energetic of the peasants), the liquidation of the middle class and later, incidentally, of the revolutionary intellectuals themselves, and an inflated bureaucracy. The Russian revolution was made possible by exceptionally favourable circumstances which are not likely to recur or operate anywhere, i.e. a despotic government, an inefficient ruling class, a demoralized army, and a highly intelligent urban proletariat all combined to produce such circumstances. The industrialization, moreover, was carried out on the broad shoulders of millions of long-suffering Soviet peasants who endured terrible disasters in silence. The Jewish people do not possess so many mute beasts of burden.

In an interview with Stalin, H. G. Wells told the Soviet leader that class war was an out-of-date method of economic and social reconstruction—a method not likely to make an appeal to the advanced industrial countries. H. G. Wells knows his Englishman or his American. He realizes that the Englishman holds that Mr. John Employer is a better and more efficient man than Johnnie, the Employee, and being practical he abhors the idea of “finishing off” Mr. John so that Johnnie shall control the factory, and in England and other advanced countries, Mr. John is a powerful man and cannot easily be liquidated.

The Jews, like the Anglo-Saxons, have been the great agents of capitalism in the modern world, and their economic structure has been delicate and complex. They are not likely to adopt clumsy methods in the difficult transition period between the two eras: for class war means profuse bleeding and the danger of death.

The second method is the Fascist one. The Fascist looks

on the world as a jungle. Ferocious beasts are out for blood and prey and whichever beast has the sharper teeth and stronger claws survives. Hence the best chance of survival for a nation is to have the sharpest teeth and the sharpest claws. To the nightmare of the jungle he adds the conception of the anthill and the beehive. Life is blind and mechanical. The queen is supreme and very jealous and all other queens are massacred; the soldiers are born to die and the workers to toil ceaselessly. Only the queen can have glory but for the rest there is nothing but routine, slavery, and death. Fascism is another great example of a blind alley in the history of life. If Fascism succeeds the whole course of human evolution will be deflected and the design of the Creator will be frustrated.

The Jews, the first people to conceive a moral order in the world, cannot, of course, accept the distorted philosophy of the Fascists nor their brutal methods which vitiate all the decent things which man has learnt since he left the jungle. The basic principle of Judaism is "love thy neighbour as thyself". This applies not only to individuals but also to nations. Once a nation proclaims that it is a law unto itself, once a nation chooses to be above law and morality, it embarks on a slippery journey which inevitably ends in disaster. Unity achieved by Fascist methods is immoral, it is the unity of the thieves' den and the robber gang and must be condemned and rejected outright.

Unity achieved by the Anglo-Saxons is slower, less obvious and less spectacular, but it is compensated by a strong staying power, and by the fact that even in times of apparent discord and weakness there is an underlying unity which is far more real and sound than that achieved by the militarist nations. The Anglo-Saxon's ideals and institutions, government by discussion, the supremacy of law, respect for personality, moralism, public spirit, have proved their inherent superiority to the other two challengers, and are likely to show even greater signs of successful evolution in the future.

Anglo-Saxon institutions are not entirely suitable for the

Jewish people and should not be imitated indiscriminately. They are a delicate growth of centuries and require long and careful training. The Englishman has a wide political experience and an inborn gift for self-discipline. The Jew is argumentative and impatient: he needs a system of government which can inspire him with devotion and enthusiasm rather than one which relies on his political sagacity or any other Anglo-Saxon virtues. Moreover, the building of a new State will require unprecedented effort and sacrifice and there can be little room for the excessive legalism and protection of private rights which characterize Anglo-Saxon institutions.

The problem which faces the Zionists in Palestine is how to create effective unity, without resorting to either the concept of class war or Fascist dictatorship and without submitting to vested interests and excessive private rights. This is a tough job but it has to be done.

Jewish Collectivism

One of the most significant trends in the modern world is the trend towards collectivism. The Oxford Dictionary defines collectivism as a theory that the land and the means of production should be owned by the community for the benefit of the people as a whole. But since the term is such a wide one and since it assumes so many forms, it is better perhaps to refer to the problem of collectivism as the problem of transforming an economic society run for profit to an economic society run for the common good.

In Russia collectivism has assumed an extreme form. The land and the means of production are owned by the community and the pursuit of profit is no longer the motive of economic activities. In Germany and Italy collectivism assumes pathological form. In the Fascist communities the motive of profit is largely subordinated to the interests of the State and to the perverted war economy. In the Anglo-Saxon countries, although the land and the means of production do not belong to the community as a whole, collectivism is slowly but surely evolving. Before the war a famous English

politician said: "We are all socialists nowadays", and Bernard Shaw insisted that England will become Socialist in spite of the Socialists. Since the war England has acquired what J. Huxley calls the "group mind" and is spending today more than half of its National Income on a collective purpose, i.e. the prosecution of the war. Everyone living in England at the present time can see for himself the growth of the authority, powers, and resources of the community as a whole. The English Revolution which is taking place before our very eyes is as significant, if less spectacular, than the French or Russian Revolutions.

For the Jews the problem of collectivism will be of the greatest urgency in the years following the war. Even if collectivism were not a universal tendency, the Jews in Palestine would have stumbled on it independently and would have applied it by sheer weight and pressure of necessity and circumstances.

To undertake the settlement of the Jewish masses in Palestine after the war will require enormous resources. The scale on which it will have to be done will dwarf the colonization carried out in Palestine up to the present. The combined income of the Zionist Organization and the Palestine Government after the last war could hardly meet a fraction of the need. What is needed is not only the resources of a State, but of such a State which has full control over the economic activities and the life of the country and which is primarily organized for the furtherance of colonization. There will have to be a Government with wartime powers devoted to peacetime reconstruction. It will have to be able to organize the economy of the country in such a way as to ensure maximum productivity.

One of the reasons why mass migration and mass settlement could not be undertaken after the last war was because in Palestine an Administration was in power which did not understand or did not want to understand that colonial rule was incompatible with an enterprise of such magnitude.

Max Nordau, the veteran Zionist leader, worked out a plan

in 1920 for the immediate transfer of half a million Jews to Palestine. The plan was not realized because Palestine was not ripe for it. The *laissez-faire* of the British Administration, the feebleness of the Jewish pressure from Europe, the ups and downs of Jewish capitalism were its mortal enemies.

It is no secret that the country in the past failed to absorb many Jewish immigrants who hoped to make Palestine their home. To be a success in the Palestine of those days required what Shalom Asch described as a "genius for Palestine", i.e. a certain ability and will power to be absorbed in the organism of the country. This genius many of the immigrants did not possess, and the cities of Europe and America are filled with Jews who have deserted and who have brought back bad reports of the land.

Partly it is a question of the right training, but it is also a question of the ability of a society to offer each man an opportunity for service and an honourable way of making a living. People who come to Palestine must be offered bread and not stones, however holy. The wasteful competition, the mad scramble and restlessness, the intense struggle for a livelihood and ruinous speculation of the past should give way to comprehensive planning, to the pooling of resources and to efficient organization.

The war has shown that there can be work for everyone, and what can be done in wartime for the purpose of destruction can be done in peacetime for the purpose of construction. In Palestine, we have only the nucleus of a State, but the main structure still remains to be built and will require every available hand and very available brain. In the early stages of this unparalleled State-building, a flood of humanity will reach the shores of Palestine and it will have to be housed and fed. This flood will not consist of capitalists, men of wealth, but it will be an army of dispossessed and hungry men. An old-fashioned State, based on *laissez-faire* like the present Palestinian administration with a budget of about eight million pounds, will not be able to cope with such an

onrush. Only a collectivist State will be able to canalize the flood of human energy.

The need for Jewish collectivism arises also from the peculiar and abnormal structure of the Jewish people. Since the overthrow of the Jewish State the Jews have concentrated on the study of the Law and regarded the scholar as the best man among them. The Jews, therefore, have produced a superabundance of intellectuals which in modern times has become rather embarrassing. This surplus of intellectuals has created an unemployed intelligentsia and has become a cause of distress to the intellectuals, to the Jewish people, and to the world. Government after Government and nation after nation have sought to limit their numbers in the Universities, and to restrict their professional activities. When some of them in despair join the revolutionary movements, the whole race is accused of fomenting unrest and of seeking to undermine the social order. The Jewish intellectuals feel very keenly about their aimless and frustrated existence. They have a grievance against the world and against their nation. They demand the elementary right of employing their skill and of being useful to society.

Experience in wartime England, in Soviet Russia and elsewhere has shown that the collectivist society is best suited to absorb brain workers. Educated people, far from being an encumbrance and a nuisance, are in great demand in societies which are engaged in constructive work on a large scale.

In a collectivist State the Jewish misfortune of excessive brainpower can be turned into a great blessing. A State which undertakes a task requiring an enormous amount of planning and co-ordination cannot have too many brains. Brains are useless in a static society but in a dynamic one they tend to find their right place in the scheme of things.

Then there is a problem of land. The laws of supply and demand have operated with cruelty and have caused disappointment and anxiety to the Zionists. Prices of land, which under the Turks could be bought for a song, have rocketed sky-high in response to the Jewish land-bunker.

Zionists compare with some bitterness the facilities offered to colonists in the British Dominions and in some South American lands to the uneconomic prices which they have had to pay and which have proved to be such a heavy drain on their meagre resources.

This process of treating land as a commercial commodity cannot go on indefinitely without bringing ruin to the aspirations of Zionism and to the economy of the country. Both the interests of Zionism and of Palestinian economy require that the Jewish State should embark on a policy of the nationalization of land for the intensive settlement of Jewish immigrants.

A Jewish State to which the Jews will transplant the ghetto mode of life would not meet the needs of the people. The Jews have for centuries lived from hand to mouth and pursued shortsighted economic policies. Only a collectivist State can pull the Jews out of the mire of economic anarchy and (in the long run) meaningless and futile pursuit of private gain.

It is noteworthy that in the two most important and exciting periods of Jewish history (the Second Temple and the present period) there have been successful experiments in collectivism. About two thousand years ago the Essenes—4,000 strong—lived in a collectivist society, based on the principles of service, self-discipline, and faith in God and justice. "They will not", says Josephus, "suffer anything to hinder them from having all things in common, so that a rich man enjoys no more of his own wealth than he who has nothing at all. . . . It also deserves our admiration, how much they exceed all other men that addict themselves to virtue, and this in righteousness, and indeed to such a degree, that it both never appeared among any other men, neither Greeks nor barbarians." Zionism, too, has produced men who "addict themselves to virtue and husbandry". There are in Palestine today about thirty thousand Jews, living in eighty settlements, who have succeeded in solving the problem of equal distribution of wealth by the pursuit of a collectivist adventure.

The experiment is of significance to the world at large, but it is perhaps of greater significance for the development of the Yishuv. The application of collectivism not only in local settlements but also in the national life of the country will be one of the great problems of post-war Zionism.

Admittedly some of the features of life in the settlements are crude and even injurious to the development of human personality and economic efficiency. These, however, can be remedied by relaxations of extreme theories and modes of living and by intelligent adaptation to circumstances.

Two traditions should be maintained. One is tolerance. Jewish collectivism will gain by not being doctrinaire, and by not abusing its powers to suppress or oppress other forms of life. Private enterprise played a leading part in the capitalist phase of Zionism. Some two hundred farm settlements on lines of individual ownership existed side by side with eighty communal settlements. The relative importance of "private capital" and "national capital" since 1920 was 5-1. In the future the ratio is likely to be reversed, but both common sense and the spirit of fair play counsel that there should be no confiscation or "liquidation" on the Russian model. Secondly, the new collectivism must be able to inspire faith and fervour. The Jews are ready for it. The young, thinking Jews, at any rate, are weary of the struggle for wealth; they are in revolt against Mammon, they have rejected the old idols and are in search of a new God and a new civilization.

The sense of justice which is ingrained in the Jewish character cannot fail to contribute to the rise of a new society. If one of the old Jewish prophets had lived in Palestine in the last sixty years he would have had a bitter sermon to preach to the Jews. He would have described the hardships of the Jewish pioneers—the young men and women who built the houses, paved the roads, drained the swamps, and planted the forests. He would have reminded the Jews of hungry days and hungry nights which the best part of the Jewish youth had to endure, of burning sands, of feet without shoes, of insufficient clothing, and of tents and bare rooms as homes.

He would have shown that many perished in the struggle, that many have become invalids and aged prematurely and that many have been left to take care of themselves after their strength has gone.

He would have fulminated against speculators, crooks, and middlemen who infested the country and against the gold-worshippers and their cowardice. And in the manner of the prophets of old he would have ended on a note of comfort and hope. The amazing vitality and moral energy which the Yishuv has nevertheless displayed, the searching of hearts among its men would have convinced him that when the new era dawns the blemishes and faults will vanish.

The Violin

It was once said of Herzl that he was a great violinist without a violin. It can also be said that the Jews are great violinists without a violin. They have great gifts and potentialities, but they have not yet found expression for their national genius. If the Jews are given an opportunity of building up a civilization of their own, their past discontents, restlessness, and dissipation may turn into a creative force the like of which the world has never seen. The world will then listen to their music with thrill and excitement.

What kind of civilization the Jews will build in Palestine is impossible to foretell. One can only see some of the immediate and urgent tasks. The rest of the vision is obscure. On rare occasions one can, however, catch a glimpse into the future. Sometimes it comes when all of a sudden a Jewish colony, green and splendid, appears on the horizon in the Palestinian sands or marshes. Sometimes it comes during a performance at a theatre of a good and original Hebrew play, a sincere and passionate speech in the People's House in Tel-Aviv, or community singing in an agricultural settlement. Sometimes one can catch it watching sunburnt but excited Jews constructing a new port on the shores of the Mediterranean, harnessing the Jordan for electricity, or descending in lorries to the Dead Sea to get chemical materials.

Sometimes one can catch it on a moonlight walk round the walls of ancient Jerusalem where the atmosphere is pregnant with the spirit of eternity. The past and the future then become one, and the conviction grows that divine music was once heard on the hills of Palestine and that it will be heard again.

A TALE OF THREE LANDS

Difficulties in Palestine

It is an encouraging sign to see how Jews are gradually beginning to understand that the Jewish State is the central idea of the Jewish people in modern times, and that only a State can release the Jews from the cul-de-sac of the Diaspora. Few serious leaders in touch with the Jewish masses dare suggest that the task of rehabilitating the Jewish people in its homeland can be achieved without a free hand in colonization and without the mighty instrument of statehood.

But even if statehood is conceded, the Jews in Palestine will still have to contend with serious difficulties which should be faced now. Their solution will require all the courage and vision of world statesmanship.

First there is the question of land. Three generations of Zionists have clearly realized that there can be no national life without a return to the soil. For sixty years Jewish colonization has been based on the purchase of land. But while the Jews have succeeded in becoming the predominant urban element in Palestine, and while they have succeeded in becoming almost a third of the Palestinian population, only about 6 to 8 per cent of the Jews are actually engaged in agriculture,¹¹ and only 7 per cent¹² of the land in Palestine is actually in Jewish hands.

It is self-evident that a Jewish State without Jewish land, and without a compact Jewish peasantry, is a farce. The power of the State is ultimately based on the soil. History has shown that whoever possesses the land is the master of the country. Land is the constant factor in the life of a nation. Economic systems decay and develop, but the land remains. It is there to stay. Without it the Jews will be aliens in their own country.

That the land in Palestine should be in fact, and not only in name, Jewish is one of the cardinal axioms of Zionism.

It cannot and should not be evaded. If it is not honestly faced, Jewish national life will become a mockery and its ultimate downfall a certainty.

The Crusaders tried it before. They were in control of the important cities of Palestine but not of the countryside. In the end they were overwhelmed and dislodged from their positions.

If there is a nightmare which haunts the Zionists it is that they will only manage to create a super-ghetto on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, a sort of Hebrew-speaking New York without the American hinterland.

Another difficulty has been that of Jewish labour. The Jews in Palestine had to choose between the method of colonization adopted in Kenya and other parts of Africa or that in North America and Australia. That is to say, they had to decide whether they were going to create in Palestine a class of employers, landowners, professional people, and officials, surrounded by subservient masses of Arab fellahin and Arab manual workers, or whether they were going to build an integral national organism consisting not merely of professors, businessmen, and administrators but also of agricultural workers, navvies and so on. They decided to adopt the second and more difficult method.

One of the epic stories in world history and the great adventure in Jewish history is how young Jews dedicated themselves to manual labour in order that the Jewish national body should have not only a head and a brain but also a pair of strong hands and powerful shoulders. Only people who know the Jews intimately and know their individualism, ambitions, intellectual gifts and restlessness can appreciate the magnitude of the sacrifice and the immensity of revolution which the new mode of life has demanded from them.

Yet this decision by the Jewish idealists has been attacked from various quarters. A section of Jewish employers has preferred the more docile and less expensive Arab labourer to the Jewish labourer. It has been resented by Arabs who cannot understand why Jewish employers should hire men who

are not accustomed to the climate and conditions of the country, and why they should pay them higher wages. Moreover, some English observers hold the view that the Jews are discriminating against the Arabs. The Jews retort that Arab employers engage only Arab workers, that the Arabs are the main beneficiaries of the public works undertaken by the Government and other bodies, and that on the whole they have greatly prospered from the Jewish settlement in Palestine. They insist that it is the Jewish workers and not the Arab workers who need special protection. They maintain that the unfriendly attitude to the Zionist Labour policy is based on a superficial study of purely local affairs and a lack of comprehension of the uphill struggle of the Jew to free himself from an unhealthy social structure and to build solid foundations for a national State.

Yet the Labour problem in Palestine is a cause for anxiety. Who would be so bold as to assert that Jewish labour would continue to grow and develop in spite of the pressure of economic facts and the existence of a large reserve of Arab fellahs and labourers? Can sheer idealism sustain itself over many generations?

The question of security raises another difficulty. Sir Samuel Hoare said in the House of Commons in 1930 that in the East there was not too good a tradition in the matter of the treatment of minorities. This view is confirmed by the study not only of the disturbances in Palestine but also by the study of the history of the Maronites in Lebanon and the Assyrians in Iraq.

The Arabs are an easy prey to unscrupulous agitation. I remember the Arab riots in Palestine in 1929. Arab fellahs who are normally so peaceful and inoffensive were turned into wild beasts. They tasted blood and were hardly the same. I saw them running in the streets of Jerusalem delirious with excitement. I saw the foam on their mouths and the gleam of fanaticism in their eyes. I saw them attacking and stabbing innocent passers-by. The atmosphere was intolerable and it was heavily charged with electricity. It all came to pass be-

cause false rumours had been circulated that the Jews would seize the Moslem Holy Places. Riots in the East start on the flimsiest of grounds. A mere conversation in the market-place, a scuffle on the pavement, a false report sedulously circulated, and in a few hours the whole countryside is in flames.

A new world order will arise, a new system of international law will come into operation. Solemn declarations will be made, but all that will not change the temper of the Arab fellah or the mentality of the chauvinist effendi. The removal of racial and communal conflicts in Palestine cannot be brought about by international slogans.

Lastly, the task of rehabilitating the Jewish people in Palestine requires a common will, strenuous efforts, unity in thought and action and a policy of collectivism. How can this be attained in a country divided into two airtight compartments of economic, cultural, and political life. Experience has shown that the Jews can achieve a great deal more in a purely Jewish enterprise than in an Arab-Jewish enterprise. The Jewish Municipality of Tel-Aviv has been far more effective and constructive than the Arab-Jewish Municipality of Jerusalem. In the mixed enterprise the result has invariably been that the more progressive element has tended to be pulled down to the Levantine level.

The question that has to be answered is whether the Jewish State can effectively build up a new society when the Arabs—still a majority in the land—are not reconciled to the new ideas and are even hostile to them. Can this gigantic task succeed when a considerable proportion of the population is pulling in other directions? What should be done with the potential dynamite which can blow the whole edifice to pieces?

Some of the Jewish Marxists in Palestine advocate that the Arab working-class should be won over to Jewish Socialism, and that it is the task of Zionism to divert the allegiance of the Arab working-class from the Arab effendis towards mutual understanding and a common policy. The idea is an attrac-

tive one but suffers from fatal flaws. Experience in Palestine has shown, and this has been admitted by the leaders of Jewish labour, that only in isolated cases have Jewish labour organizations succeeded in converting the Arabs to their own ideas and policies. Their efforts have been similar in the results to the efforts of the Christian missionaries among the Jews. The converts are few and not of the best type. The Arab peasant, if he is at all interested in the affairs outside his village, is moved by his religion, and to a certain extent he is influenced by what is being said in the cafés of Damascus, Baghdad, and Jaffa and by what the Arabic Press in Egypt and elsewhere writes. But he has little understanding of class solidarity. Like the best people in Europe he has never read Karl Marx, but, unlike the best people in Europe, he does not even know of the existence of such a name.

To drive a wedge between the Arab ruling class and the masses of the Arabs is not an easy task. It is difficult to find in the modern world an example where an alien race has succeeded in driving a wedge between a people and its leaders. In any case, it is a slow and laborious process of education. It is a matter of generations and the Jews have to undergo metamorphosis in our own generation.

Frustration in Iraq

It is a tradition to begin a speech or an article on Iraq with the words that Iraq is a land of great potentialities. It is not a mere idle phrase.

A series of civilizations flourished in Mesopotamia and a complex system of irrigation existed there in her days of greatness. It is the traditional garden of Eden.

Sir William Willcocks, who studied the problem of irrigation in Mesopotamia between 1908-11, painted a rosy picture of the future of that country. "With the Euphrates and Tigris both really controlled, the delta of the two rivers would attain a fertility of which history has no record, and we should see men flocking in from India and making the plain of Shinar a rival of the land of Egypt."

J. T. Parfit, an English clergyman who knows Iraq well, wrote a pamphlet in 1917 entitled the *Key to the Future*. He said that Mesopotamia held the key to the whole world's future, that it was situated at the heart of the eastern hemisphere, that it was closely connected with the most thrilling epochs of history and was likely to emerge once more from obscurity. He had visions of the finest wheat fields in the world to reduce the price of the people's bread, of the reopening of its ancient highways and the construction of great railways to India and the Far East. He believed "that in the settlement of Mesopotamia and the adjacent lands of Islam lies the possible doom of despotism and the dawn of a better era for the inhabitants of all five continents." In 1920, in a book called *Marvellous Mesopotamia—the World's Wonderland*, he prophesied that the "ideals of the League of Nations will be tested and put into practical operation", and that in Mesopotamia "Western civilization will be compelled to come to an understanding with the Mohammedan world . . . There", he says, "we shall also observe the beginnings of a new era for the Jewish race and Arab race . . ." He made an appeal to American statesmen "not to stand aloof and watch, as if from another planet, the greatest changes that have ever affected the future of mankind", i.e. "the reconstruction of both Europe and Asia".

T. E. Lawrence also spoke in the same vein. He emphasized that Iraq was the centre of gravity of the Arab world. "The weight and importance of the Semitic States have always lain in Baghdad for very sound reasons of economics and population. Syria is a poor country, small and mountainous, dry, lacking in minerals and in arable land. There is no probability that her natural population will ever be dense. Mesopotamia has big rivers, and a huge area of irrigable land. Her wealth in grain and cotton will be very great and nature may have bestowed on her abundance of cheap fuel. Should that be the case she will inevitably take the leadership of the Arab world in the future, as so often in the past. Damascus may hold an interim pre-eminence. Baghdad must

be the ultimate regent, with perhaps five times the population of Syria, and many times its wealth. Mesopotamia will be the master of the Middle East and the power controlling its destinies will dominate all its neighbours."

In the House of Commons speeches were made in which it was confidently predicted that the country would become the centre of the corn supply of the world and a vital centre of air communication. H. G. Wells, by the way, seized upon the idea, and in his book, *The Shape of Things to Come*, he describes how a group of airmen in Basrah in Iraq built up the nucleus of a new world order. Winston Churchill, as Colonial Secretary, also realized the importance of that part of the world. An M.P., talking of the ambitions of Churchill in the Middle East, said "he 'conjured up visions of a new millennium, the resurrection of Nebuchadnezzar and the re-building of Nineveh'" (1923).

These were the visions. Now, what is the reality? You have in Iraq an area more than ten times the area of Palestine, with a potential population of 15 million sustaining a population of 3½ million in unbelievable poverty. The official Report (1930) estimates that the fellah earns 80 rupees a year and the shepherd about 60 rupees a year, that he works four hours a day and nine months a year. Ernest Main estimates that the fellah lives on about a penny a day. All observers agree that he is heavily in debt and very backward. Such is the condition of the land of which it has been said "tickle the surface and it smiles a crop".

The budget of the Government of Iraq in 1939–40 was about 6 million pounds, i.e. not much more than the budget of the Government of Palestine. The imports were £8,156,179 and the exports £3,759,401. The capital works were undertaken on a small scale and they were only made possible by oil royalties which in the financial year of 1939–40 amounted to roughly £2,000,000. The oil enterprises are, of course, a non-Arab undertaking.

When we attempt to find the reason for the discrepancy between the dreams and the reality, between the visions and

the attainments, we shall see that the story of frustration in Iraq is not very much different from that of Palestine, though in Palestine the record of achievement is by far the more formidable.

The weariness of Britain after the last war, and the policy of isolation in America, governed the situation in the Middle East, as they did in so many other parts of the world.

It is instructive to go through the Parliamentary debates of the years following the last war. The following are some typical statements made by M.P.s In June 1921 an M.P. said. "The Government have wasted and still are wasting money in the desert sands of Mesopotamia and Palestine, in so-called social reform schemes after the war which the nation cannot afford, and in bureaucratic expansion, at a time when the trade of the country has never been so bad or taxation so high and after a war which has consumed the natural resources" In March 1923 an M.P. complained of the cost to the British of developing Mesopotamia and exclaimed that "it is not worth while painting red the map of the world at such a price". At the same session another M.P. threatened: "If we are going to continue pouring money into the sandy deserts of Mesopotamia, and building railways and annoying Arabs with bombs and other things, I shall be compelled to oppose the Government."

Lloyd George and Winston Churchill attempted to call a halt to the spirit of isolationism and retrenchment. In June 1920 Lloyd George said in connection with a debate on Mesopotamia "Are we, after all that we have done, all that we have achieved, really going to give it up through weariness of the burden? You cannot, the moment war is over, suddenly say, that is over, let us clear up, let us go home, let us drop our rifles, let us shut down the War Office and the Admiralty"

In June 1921 Winston Churchill spoke on the Middle East: "We cannot, after what we have said and done, leave the Jews in Palestine to be maltreated by the Arabs who have been inflamed against them, nor can we leave the great and

historic city of Baghdad and other cities and towns in Mesopotamia to be pillaged by the wild Bedouins."

The attempt was only partly successful. In Palestine the Zionist scope of work was curtailed in 1922, and in Iraq Britain decided to abandon her military occupation and her schemes of development and left the Arabs in Iraq to manage their own affairs. In 1921 Feisal became the King of Iraq, and a clever and ingenious scheme was evolved by which the R.A.F. was given a free hand to develop control in the country. Otherwise the country was left to stew in its own juice.

Iraq was fortunate at first in having a great Arab at the helm of the State. Feisal was a statesman and a man of character. If circumstances had been favourable he would have lifted Arab nationalism from the narrow groove of petty politics and negative policies. With his death the story of Iraq becomes almost entirely a record of anarchy and incompetence.

In 1936, for instance, a *coup d'état* was carried out by the Army and Air Force, and the Cabinet were compelled to resign by a threat of an air bombardment of Baghdad. The revolt took place because the Army "had lost patience with the Government which had been concerned only with their personal interests and had disregarded the public welfare". General Jafar Pasha, the Minister of Defence, was assassinated near Bagdad by an officer. The revolt was preceded by a series of outbreaks against Jews, during which five men were murdered.

Mr. Eden's comment in Parliament on the events in Iraq was that the Government were concerned at the resignation of a constitutionally appointed Government as a result of violent action by Army leaders and that the new Prime Minister had been warned of the deplorable effect which would be caused by any further outrages like the murder of Jafar Pasha.

In 1937 General Baqir Sidki, Chief of Staff, together with the head of the Air Force, was assassinated at the Mosul Aerodrome by an Iraqi soldier.

In 1939, following the death of King Gazi in a motor accident, the British consul in Mosul was murdered.

In 1940 the Minister of Finance was murdered. General Nuri Said, the Prime Minister, desired an extended enquiry into the incident but failed to secure it.

In 1941 Rashid Ali, with the support of the Pan-Arabists, expelled the Cabinet and deposed the Regent. Under his rule serious riots against the Jews took place in Baghdad. The British Government regarded the coup as unconstitutional and inspired by the Axis. The story of the despatch of British troops to Iraq and the overthrow of Rashid Ali is too well known to be repeated here.

I have not quoted these incidents in order to disparage Arab nationalism. God knows how easy it is to find faults in the life of every nation, let alone of a young and inexperienced one. I have done it in order to show the great need for diverting the energy of Arab nationalism from assassinating politicians and organizing massacres of Assyrians and Jews towards the channels of constructive nationalism.

One obstacle on the way to the attainment of this object has already been noted, i.e. the indifference of the English-speaking world after the last war. But there are many more obstacles.

There is the problem of internal strife in the country. Like Syria, Iraq suffers from lack of cohesion. There is the religious division between Shias and Sunnis, the Kurdish problem and the Jewish problem.

There is the tyranny of the family over the individual which stifles enterprise and initiative not only in Iraq but throughout the Arab world.

There is the problem of education among the Arabs. Very often the study of Arabic and Arabic literature is considered as a liberal education by itself. When an Iraqi masters also the English language he often considers that he has nothing more to learn. He expects a Government job as a matter of course, and is furious when he fails to secure one. When he does get a job he considers it his holy duty to use his influ-

ence to provide jobs for all his cousins and nephews. The Arabs are reluctant, therefore, to acquire a technical education. When the British established technical schools in Iraq they were not a great success. Parents complained that nothing tangible was produced at the schools or that the boys were coming home with oily hands.

There is lack of capital Sir William Willcocks estimated that his programme of irrigation would cost about £26,537,000. The Turks were not in a position to obtain the necessary funds and the Iraqis are in the same position. They have undertaken only piecemeal work with the money made available by the oil royalties.

The British war effort in Mesopotamia included extensive agricultural undertakings and experimental farms. When the Iraqi Government assumed control there was a great curtailment of activities. Sir Hamilton E. Young in his Report on Economic Conditions and Policy respecting Iraq (1930) emphasizes that the hardships to the economy of the country arise from the geographical isolation of the country, the incompleteness of her railway system and lack of roads and bridges to feed the railway and river transportation. The weaknesses can, in the last resort, be traced to lack of capital and also lack of population.

The last point is the kernel of the whole problem. It underlies the impotence of the entire economy of Iraq and the backward state of transport and irrigation. The very future of Arab nationalism depends on the right policy of population.

Sir George Buchanan, in *The Tragedy of Mesopotamia*, attacks Sir Will's scheme of irrigation on the ground that it is useless to spend millions of pounds in irrigation schemes if there are no people to farm the land when irrigated. He points out that in India and Egypt, where extensive irrigation works have been carried out, there has been a teeming population waiting to form the irrigation colonies the moment the water was available. "The population of Egypt is 1,000 to the square mile, the Indian Punjab 177 per square mile,

and Bengal 540 per square mile, but in Mesopotamia there is a population of only 10 to the square mile."

A similar view is also put forward in His Majesty's Government's Report on the Progress of Iraq. It talks of a "relatively small agricultural population" and complains of a "gravely insufficient agricultural population". It estimates that the Arab able-bodied male agricultural population of the country is less than 500,000 and takes the view that one of two ways to foster real agricultural development is through "an increase of population such as would provide a sufficient agricultural population for land brought within schemes of irrigation".

That Iraq is a land capable of absorbing a very large population was realized by the Indian authorities. At the end of the last war Edwin Montagu, then Secretary of State for India, had in mind a scheme of colonization for Mesopotamia so as to provide an outlet for India's surplus population. Moreover, the idea of making Iraq a cotton-growing country originated in India, as it was hoped that a cotton-growing Iraq might solve the problem of over-population in India. In the earlier phase of the British occupation of the country the tendency towards the so-called "Indianization" of the country was very strong. Indian officials, soldiers, currency and law were introduced, and the transformation of Baghdad into a new Delhi was contemplated. It failed. The Arabs resented the intrusion of an alien race and alien methods. One of the causes leading to the serious disturbances in 1920 was the process of "Indianization". But there can be no resentment against the settlement of Arab peasants and the building up of Arab nationalism there.

To sum up, Iraq is the classical land of under-population. The anaemia of under-population is further aggravated by lack of capital, skill, and initiative.

Will the Anglo-Saxons perform an Operation?

Transfer of population may become the solution of the minority problem in Europe. It may also serve as the solution of the Middle East. Palestine will be in a position to relieve Poland and other European lands of the Jewish problem. Iraq may help to solve the great difficulties of Palestine by undertaking the settlement of Palestinian Arab peasants on its fertile soil. Transfer of population may become the master stroke which will bring happiness to three nations and to two continents and cut the Gordian knot of apparently insoluble difficulties.

Transfer of population has, of course, an important precedent in modern history. It is the exchange of 1,300,000 Greeks for 400,000 Turks after the Greco-Turkish war. It was undertaken with great reluctance largely because it was contrary to international law and liberal principles. So great was the aversion to the idea that each of the delegates of the final draft of the Treaty sought to deny responsibility and quite a number of names have been mentioned as originators of the idea. Even today the paternity of the idea is not definitely established, though it is generally agreed that it was the Turkish Government which insisted on the compulsory nature of the exchange. The expert who prepared the draft on behalf of the Greek Government was so distressed that he was unable to recover his balance for some time.

Yet when the operation was over it was realized how salutary it had been. The verdict of Sir John Hope Simpson, for example, is typical: "The problem was of colossal dimensions, and has been dealt with drastically, and on the whole with great success."

The lessons of this operation are valuable and instructive. In Greece three main instruments were responsible for the settlement of the Greek refugees. (1) The International Refugee Commission appointed by the Greek Government and the Council of the League. The Commission, which consisted of two Greeks and two non-Greeks, negotiated a loan of about

10 million pounds in London, Athens, and New York, and with the money established not less than 170,000 families or more than 690,000 persons on the land (it should be remembered that only 47 per cent were agricultural refugees: the rest were urban refugees). (2) The Greek Government which provided the land, and in general bore the main financial burden of the colonization. (3) Voluntary organizations played an important part in the field of immediate relief. The refugees were at first dependent on the liberality of the American people. In March 1923, for example, the American Red Cross were feeding over half a million people every day. Its expenditure for the year ending in June 1923 was \$2,600,000.

Jewish colonization in Palestine, on the other hand, did not have a State behind it, nor was it in a position to negotiate international loans. It was largely dependent on voluntary subscriptions. Only since 1933 has there been a transfer of private property on a large scale. In fact the rapid growth of the Jewish population and Jewish enterprise in Palestine after 1933 is largely the result of the influx of capital from Germany and neighbouring countries.

After the war both factors will continue to play an important role in the financing of any radical and far-reaching solution for the Middle East. Voluntary subscriptions will flow more readily when the phase of mass migration and mass colonization begins. The Jews in the English-speaking world will respond more eagerly when a new political message reaches them.

Transfer of property will become the main issue in the negotiations between the European Powers and the Jews and between the Arab States and the Jews. It should be remembered that there are nearly 100,000 Jews in Iraq who have suffered great hardships and indignities at the hands of the Arabs in recent years. Today many of them are very anxious to settle in Palestine. Some of them are wealthy merchants, and their property will be a matter for negotiations between Arabs and Jews.

In addition there will be other sources which will prove to be of the greatest importance. There will be a Jewish State with wide powers of taxation, planning and economic control or ownership. There will be international loans or even Lease-Lend assistance from America. On the whole it can confidently be asserted that the resources which will be available for the reconstruction of the Middle East will be far greater than those which the Greeks and the League of Nations had after the Greco-Turkish War. Such resources should enable the Middle East to stand on its feet, to attain prosperity and to meet the heavy obligations which will have to be incurred at the outset. There should be enough for the requirements of both Arab and Jewish nationalism.

The solution is so bold and revolutionary that it will not be accepted without passionate controversies and careful study. The obstacles in the way are so great that in normal times they would have proved insurmountable. Only in a unique moment of history, which is now at hand, can such a scheme have any reasonable chance of being accepted.

The Arabs have first to be persuaded¹³ that the policy of transfer of population is not a negative one and does not envisage a sudden or forcible removal of population but a gradual and amicable emigration. It means the creation of suitable economic conditions in the land of immigration likely to attract the Arab peasants. It will be designed to foster the evolution of Arab nationalism along healthy and progressive lines.

To argue that the Arabs can do things without outside help is to ignore the lesson of the last twenty years and to disregard the views of people who should know. "So far as one can judge", says a Briton who has been to Iraq, "a hundred years may pass and the greater part of Mesopotamia, or Iraq, as it is now called, will remain the dreary wilderness that it was when the British first marched through the country, and yet by the expenditure of capital in large amounts and the employment of agriculturists of the type to be found in Turkey, India, or Egypt the country might again, to quote Sir William

Willcocks, 'blossom like a rose'." Mr. Winston Churchill in 1922, discussing the electricity concession granted to the Jewish engineer, P. Rutenberg, said. "I am told that the Arabs would have done it themselves. Who is going to believe that? Left to themselves the Arabs of Palestine would not in a thousand years have taken effective steps towards the electrification of Palestine" No one suggests that the Arabs of Iraq are better educated or more enterprising than their brethren in Palestine and the argument applies with greater force to the larger and more backward country.

The Jews have also to be persuaded that the policy of transfer of population is just and necessary. The Jews regard the whole idea with great distaste. It suggests to most of them violence, cold, hunger, endless journeys, robbery, piracy, the Inquisition, the Gestapo, sealed cattle trains, and other nightmares. Time and again in their unhappy history they have experienced the cruelty and inhumanity of expulsion. They have to be reassured that the policy of transfer is a dynamic policy of reconstruction and a means to the prevention of bloodshed and friction. They have to be cured of their inhibitions.

Moreover, after the recognition of Zionism by the British Government, the Jews actually did believe that the transfer of the Arab population from Palestine was unnecessary. They firmly held that there was room in Palestine for the two peoples. It was one of the basic principles of Jewish education in Palestine. It was taught in the schools and repeated in lectures and public meetings.

As a schoolboy in Palestine I was taught to love the Arabs and to be friends with them. We had to write essays on Arab-Jewish friendship and Arab-Jewish co-operation in Palestine. I can still recall the contents of an essay of mine published in a school magazine in Jerusalem in 1924. It was all about a judge who would arise in Palestine, unite the Arabs and Jews, overthrow a band of gangsters threatening the peace of the country and proclaim the brotherhood of the two nations in Jerusalem. I still retain my faith in this essay of my boy-

hood, though I think that Arab-Jewish friendship can only be established within the larger framework of the Middle East and by according the Jews the right of compact settlement.

I have learnt since then that there are evil men in the world who stab in the back and that treachery must be guarded against. The Jews cannot and must not be led by excessive zeal for moral principles to expose themselves to mortal blows.

I believe that many of the serious thinkers among the Jews are beginning to think along these lines. They observe with anxiety the rapid growth of Arab nationalism. The voices they hear and the tendencies they watch give them food for thought. Selfishness, blindness, intolerance, and aggressiveness are associated with most nationalist movements but are especially noticeable in a young nationalism which has not yet found its place in the world. Such a nationalism is apt to look at its neighbours with suspicion, to over-estimate its importance, to magnify its grievances, to search for a national enemy and to seek the path of glory and victory rather than the path of honest work and useful planning.

The Jews have also produced unpleasant types of chauvinists, but these are kept down with a strong hand by the leaders of the people. In the utterances of Jewish leaders one finds a moral tone which is rare to find among other nationalists. There is wisdom in their eyes emanating from a long experience in many lands: there is moderation in their voice acquired in the intense conflicts and encounters in history. When one listens to the best among them one can hear the sad music of humanity and one acquires the unshakable confidence that the Jewish race as a whole is a factor working for a moral system in the world.

One searches in vain for the uplifting voice and the moral tone among Arab leaders. All that one can hear is the shrill voice of fanaticism, hatred and empty boasts. It can be heard in Nablus as well as in Damascus and Baghdad. The Arab chauvinists, poisoned by Fascist ideas, have one great ambition, i.e. to throw the Jews into the sea.

The Jews are beginning to realize that in order to win the hearts of the Arabs they must first ensure their own physical survival. They must be able to talk with the Arabs on terms of equality and that in order to be able to talk to them on terms of equality they must have a real Jewish State and a genuine Jewish peasantry. Without them their struggle for a home will be doomed at the outset. The battle will be too unequal.

The Jews, however, cannot take the initiative in the matter of the transfer of population. In the first place, they know that such a demand would be used as an argument against them, that they would have to face crude charges of planning "to drive the Arabs out of Palestine", that it would be twisted and misrepresented in order to undermine the Zionist structure in Palestine, and that it would be exploited by the enemies of the Jewish people throughout the world to injure their position and honour.

In the second place, the problem is of such vast proportions and involves so many dangers and worldwide repercussions, that it can only be solved by international initiative and international supervision. It is a world problem and as such it is of primary concern to the Anglo-Saxons. It is from them that the world expects leadership, courage, and vision.

It is significant that Britons have already given thought to the subject. While the Jews have been afraid even to raise the matter, non-Jews have openly discussed it. Lord Gwydyr (1841-1915) saw the solution to the Arab problem along the following lines. "It is also possible that the native population, on having risen from its present state of depression to a higher level, may endeavour, in a measure, to better its economic position by settling down in neighbouring provinces. Colonization of the lands to the east of Palestine by Arabs would considerably reduce the Arab population of Palestine. Already since the centre of gravity of the Arab race is not situated in Palestine, the area of friction arising from national-political motives is considerably reduced."

The Report of the Royal Commission under the chairman-

ship of Lord Peel appealed to Arabs and Jews in Palestine to study the problem of transfer of population between Greece and Turkey. "Arab and Jewish leaders", it says, "might show the same high statesmanship as that of the Turks and the Greeks and make the same bold decision for peace." What the Peel Report had to recommend in 1937 for a partitioned Palestine could obviously be more effectively undertaken within the larger framework of the Middle East.

In June 1939 Colonel C. E. Vickery wrote "The solution of Palestine is possible by strong and drastic action. No compromise, no policy of partition, no offer of independence after a period of years will achieve a final settlement. By every right Palestine is the lawful home of the Jews, and there is no overwhelming obstacle to the recognition of the fact by the removal of all Arabs into the lands east of the Jordan, where ample space is available. Compensation for homes and for land and for states is a trifling sum in these days of financial commitments, and no middle course will succeed."

Mrs. B. Dugdale, Lord Balfour's niece, has recently been advocating the voluntary transfer of Arab population from Palestine. She stresses the fact, however, that she has encountered more opposition to her idea from her Jewish friends than from her non-Jewish friends.

Sir Norman Angell has also appealed to the British Government to be frank with the Arabs and to adopt a positive solution by transferring the Arab population from Palestine to the extensive Arab territories. Mr. Duff Cooper has similar strong views on the subject.

The views just quoted can be regarded as courageous but faint voices. The idea will grow as the days go by. It will spread to the English-speaking communities. It will find its way to the masses, to the intellectuals and then to the men in power. A bitter conflict will rage round it. Attacks will be made, denunciations will be uttered, doubts will be raised, and questions will be asked.

First, people will say that it is not wise to raise the matter at all because it will antagonize the Arab world and throw

it into the arms of the Axis. This is the old argument of appeasement versus justice. Fortunately the position in the Middle East today is one where threats are not so effective as they used to be. In the past the difficulties of Britain in that region arose from the fact that the Arabs had two suitors to woo them, the Axis and the Democracies. The Arabs enjoyed the situation and played one party against the other. They could not, however, make up their minds which side would win, so arrangements were made for both eventualities. Thus we have the Musii in Berlin while Nuri Said Pasha is installed in Baghdad. The Jews, however, had only one suitor and he, too, was rather lukewarm in his love. Today, when many Arabs realize the danger of Axis domination, both Jews and Arabs stand or fall on the merits of their case.

It is advisable to raise the matter now for another reason. There is growing evidence that the idea of transfer of population is gaining ground among students of the minority problem of Europe. Harold Butler's view in the *Lost Peace* is one example. Another is the series of articles in the *Spectator*. A third example is the series of articles of *Free Europe*. A fourth example is the speeches and articles of E. Beneš—the President of the Czechoslovak Republic. It is of the utmost importance that the minority problem in Europe, in which the Jews have a vital interest, should be related to the Arab-Jewish problem in the Middle East. Now is the time to elucidate the problem. It cannot be shelved until the end of the War, because the world must be prepared for it. If it is shelved till the War is over it may become too late. The contribution must be made now or the idea may never find realization.

Secondly, people will wonder whether Britain and America have the right to interfere so boldly in the affairs of Iraq in order to carry out the scheme. Is not Iraq a sovereign State?

It should be remembered that Britain made great sacrifices for Iraq. It spent there almost 350 million pounds (200 million pounds during the last War alone) not only for defeating the Turks but also for the liberation of the country and its development. About 100,000 British casualties fell in Iraq in

the last War. And whatever progress Iraq has made economically is mainly due to Britain. In 1919 Lord Curzon said in the House of Lords that "the advance that has been made in the last two years in the development of Mesopotamia in respect of irrigation, agricultural planning, the introduction of agricultural machinery, the education of children, and in many other ways has been amazing. More has been done in two years for these places than has been done in the five preceding centuries." Britain is certainly entitled to use her influence with the State she brought into the world. But so is America—the arsenal of the world struggle and the storehouse of the new world order America has no vested interests in that region of the world but is mainly concerned with doing justice. It will probably be America which will give the knockout blow to the Axis and it will consequently deem itself justified in contributing to the redemption of the historic region of the Middle East.

The argument of "Mind your own business" is obsolete. It has been the curse of our generation. It has been the philosophy of the diehards, isolationists, and appeasers. It has made our globe the hunting-ground of political crooks and international gangsters. Our world is so surprisingly small. Its affairs are so surprisingly inter-related. The diehards, isolationists, and appeasers are dying. Some of them are dead but they do not know it. A new conception is dawning in the world. We are all one family. And just as it is necessary to see that no nation overreaches itself so it is essential to see that no nation is without soil and without a normal existence.

This is the end of the tale. Poland, Palestine, and Iraq—is there no relation between them? Of the first land we hear reports of a cruel and inhuman struggle for existence between two martyred nations. Of the second land, we hear of a tremendous beginning but also of tremendous difficulties, and of the third we learn that it is a vast area of land desperately crying for men, skill, and capital, and anxiously awaiting the restoration of its greatness and glory. All three make an appeal

for justice to the Anglo-Saxons—the supreme appeal in history.

This book is written with the belief that the Anglo-Saxons will respond to the appeal and will preside over an enterprise which will be of the greatest moment in the upward struggle of man towards world harmony and world peace.

NOTES

1. The explanation and commentary on the service conducted in Jewish homes on the first two nights of Passover.

2. The representative body or "Parliament" of British Jewry established in the 18th century.

3. In 1937 the Palestine Royal Commission recommended the partition of Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish State, an Arab State and a new Mandate for the Holy Places. Its chairman was Lord Peel.

4. The first Russian Jewish students who settled on the land in Palestine.

5. An eminent philosopher of Jewish nationalism (1856-1927).

6. In Germany the Jewish problem has been artificially fostered from above and has assumed a grotesque and fantastic coloration. In Poland the Jewish problem arises from pressure from below. It is a fact, a very stubborn fact, which no amount of loose talk about agrarian reform, industrial progress, and a new liberalism will solve.

Poland is the reservoir of the Jewish masses—the very source of the Jewish flood which has reached so many parts of the earth. It is where the Jewish river begins its journey in modern history. The main task of the Jewish people in our generation is to transfer its very source—its centre of gravity—from Poland to Palestine.

This task will require not only the good-will of the English-speaking world but a dynamic alliance between the Jews and the new Poland. The Poles are eager and ready to help the Jewish people to build a Jewish State in Palestine. The Jews, on the other hand, should forget the petty bickerings of the past and should shake hands with another martyred nation. They should work out a plan to dissolve or alter drastically the Polish-Jewish symbiosis. They should, above all, understand the fundamental facts of the Jewish problem in Poland.

7. Palestinian Jewry.

8. Committees.

9. The Jewish Workers' Union in Palestine founded in 1920. It plays an important part in the economic life of the country.

10. The General Council of the Jews of Palestine.

11. This is the proportion of workers on the land to the Jewish population. In the Peel Report an estimate of 6·4 per cent is given, which is the estimate of workers on the land in the United Kingdom in peace-time. But the proportion of Jewish agriculturists to the economically active earners is 18·5 per cent, i.e. 37,000 out of 200,000.

12. The figure 7 per cent is of the whole land both cultivable and uncultivable land. According to an American estimate, the Jews are in possession of 12½ per cent of the cultivable land.

13. The Jewish National Fund and the Palestine Administration have already experimented in the resettlement of displaced Arab cultivators. This has not been done on a large scale because the number of displaced Arab tenants has proved to be small. Some Arab tenants have been settled in Trans-Jordan. I am convinced that a great deal can be done by peaceful negotiations and by the offer of generous terms. These negotiations will be particularly effective if they are backed by international law and the resources of a State.

It is true, of course, that there is still enough vacant land or land extensively cultivated and sparsely populated. The colonization of such land will be tackled first. But I do not believe it is enough. At this juncture of history it is unwise to concentrate on short-term rather than on long-term policies. It is unwise to ignore the implications of the Arab problem. Half measures, palliatives, timidity, hints and insinuations will not do. They are certainly wrong at a time like this, when the whole world is about to be put on a new basis. A permanent solution to the Arab-Jewish problem in the Middle-East and the Jewish problem in Europe must be attempted. If a radical solution cannot be attempted immediately after the War, will it be possible to carry it out after a decade or two when the world will settle down? If a radical solution is evaded—and I do not minimize the difficulties and risks which it involves—a great historical opportunity will be missed in favour of an inferior solution which appears modest but which in reality entails great hazards and complications.